

FRED H. SETTELMAYER: RECOLLECTIONS OF RANCHING IN CARSON VALLEY, WORK AS A NEVADA STATE SENATOR, AND INVOLVEMENT WITH WESTERN WATER PROBLEMS

Interviewee: Fred H. Settelmeyer

Interviewed: 1970

Published: 1971

Interviewer: Mary Ellen Glass

UNOHP Catalog #046

Description

Fred H. Settelmeyer, a descendent of German immigrants, was born in Carson Valley in 1892. He and his family engaged in ranching in the western Nevada-eastern California-Douglas County area for more than seventy years. He attended local schools in the valley, and Gettysburg College in Pennsylvania. He had intended to become a lawyer, but family problems intruded and he returned to ranch life.

Mr. Settelmeyer became a valuable member of the Carson Valley community. Active not only in ranching, he served on the local school board, in local political affairs, and from 1947 to 1961 in the Nevada State Senate. He also served as a member of the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission and as a member of the Pyramid Lake Task Force.

In the Nevada legislature, Fred Settelmeyer became one of the most influential members of the senate. He is probably more responsible than any other single lawmaker for Nevada's conservative postwar financial policies which helped to keep the state from resorting to deficit financing in the face of rising demands on the treasury. Interests in education also made Fred Settelmeyer one of the most prominent supporters of legislation to benefit the public schools and the University of Nevada.

Settelmeyer's career as a rancher also made him an effective lobbyist for the Nevada Cattle Association after he retired from the legislature. His positions with the Interstate Compact Commission and the Pyramid Lake Task Force were the outgrowth of his well-known expertise in water matters. Especially in dealing with the Carson River system, probably no other person can claim comparable knowledge.

The memoir includes recollections of ranch life in Carson Valley, a discussion of a fourteen-year legislative career, discussion and analysis of western water problems, and a philosophical conclusion.

FRED H. SETTELMAYER:
RECOLLECTIONS OF RANCHING IN CARSON
VALLEY, WORK AS A NEVADA STATE SENATOR, AND
INVOLVEMENT WITH WESTERN WATER PROBLEMS

**FRED H. SETTELMAYER:
RECOLLECTIONS OF RANCHING IN CARSON
VALLEY, WORK AS A NEVADA STATE SENATOR, AND
INVOLVEMENT WITH WESTERN WATER PROBLEMS**

An Oral History Conducted by Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1971
University of Nevada Oral History Program
Mail Stop 0324
Reno, Nevada 89557
unohp@unr.edu
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1971.
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:
Director: Mary Ellen Glass

University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

CONTENTS

Preface to the Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Ranch Life in Carson Valley	1
2. My Legislative Activities, 1947-1961	11
The 1947 Session	
The 1949 Session	
The 1951 Session	
The 1953 Session	
The 1954 Special Session	
The 1955 Session	
The 1956 Special Session	
The 1957 Session	
The Sessions from 1959 to 1961	
Lobbyists	
Summary of My Legislative Career	
3. Dealing with Water and Associated Issues	41
Legal Aspects of the Carson River System	
Irrigation in the Carson Valley	
The California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission	
The Pyramid Lake Task Force and Associated Problems	
Observations on the Washoe Project	
Comment on the Soil Conservation Service	

4. Summary on Political Philosophy	59
Original Index: For Reference Only	61

PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber
Director, UNOHP
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

Fred H. Settelmeyer is a descendent of German immigrants to Nevada, born in Carson Valley in 1892. He and his family engaged in ranching in the western Nevada-eastern California-Douglas County area for more than seventy years. Mr. Settelmeyer attended local schools in the Valley, and Gettysburg College in Pennsylvania. He had intended to become a lawyer, but family problems intruded and he returned to ranch life.

Mr. Settelmeyer became a valuable member of the Carson Valley community. Active not only in ranching, he served on the local school board, in local political affairs, and from 1947 to 1961 in the Nevada State Senate. He has also served the state of Nevada as a member of the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission and as a member of the Pyramid Lake Task Force.

In the Nevada legislature, Fred Settelmeyer became one of the most influential members of the senate. He is probably more responsible than any other single lawmaker for Nevada's conservative postwar financial policies which

helped to keep the state from resorting to deficit financing in the face of rising demands on the treasury. His interests in education also made Fred Settelmeyer one of the most prominent supporters of legislation to benefit the public schools and the University of Nevada. Mr. Settelmeyer's career as a rancher also made him an effective lobbyist for the Nevada Cattle Association after he retired from the legislature.

Mr. Settelmeyer's positions with the Interstate Compact Commission and the Pyramid Lake Task Force were the outgrowth of his well-known expertise in water matters. Especially in dealing with the Carson River system, probably no other person can claim comparable knowledge.

When invited to participate in the Oral History Project, Mr. Settelmeyer responded graciously. He was a careful and cooperative chronicler in five recording sessions, all at his home in Minden, Nevada, between January 12 and February 7, 1970. Mr. Settelmeyer's review of his oral history script resulted in only a few minor changes to the text. The

memoir includes recollections of ranch life in Carson Valley, a discussion of a fourteen-year legislative career, discussion and analysis of western water problems, and a philosophical conclusion.

The Oral History Project of the University of Nevada, Reno, Library preserves the past and the present for future research by tape recording the reminiscences of persons who have figured prominently in the development of Nevada and the west. Scripts resulting from the interviews are deposited in the Special Collections Departments of the University of Nevada Libraries at Reno and Las Vegas. Mr. Settelmeyer has generously assigned his literary rights to the University of Nevada, Reno, with the provisos that no access to the script will be allowed during the tenure of the Pyramid Lake Task Force, and that no quotation or attribution will be made without his permission during his lifetime.

Mary Ellen Glass
University of Nevada, Reno
1970

RANCH LIFE IN CARSON VALLEY

Our outline calls for a brief resume of my father and mother. Both came from Germany in the early '80's; by that, I mean 1880. I'm sure both came for the same purpose, for adventure, some adventure—largely freedom and making their own way in life. They both worked at the Dangberg home ranch, Mother [Maria Worthmann] for about two and a half years, and then she went into Carson and worked for the then Governor Jewett W. Adams family. Dad [H. William Settlemeyer] continued to work at the Dangberg ranch for seven or eight years.

Mother's family were cabinetmakers; in fact, at least six or seven generations in descendants are still in that same business in Germany. Of course, I always feel that Mother was a very delightful person, and I have always wished that every boy could have the same kind of a mother that I had.

And Father's people in Germany were agriculturalists, or agriculturist. Dad seldom spoke of any of his early life. don't know how far back it went, but others have told me that [the land had] been in the Settlemeyer

family for some three hundred years in Germany.

Prior to coming here, he put in his training period in the German army, which he didn't like at all, as he was in the caste system that existed in the old German army of the 1870's. As soon as he got out of the army, he picked up his younger brother, and they both came to Carson Valley, Father beginning his employment with the Dangberg Company, and his brother with the H. H. Springmeyer family.

After working for the Dangbergs, my mother and dad were married and they bought the first portion of what finally became the Settlemeyer ranch. This was in 1888.

Life was harsh and difficult. Mother worked in the field as much as she could while trying to raise six children. Helped make butter (there were no creameries at the time); they made the butter on the ranch, took it to Carson to sell. And of course, transportation was entirely by team, winter or summer.

The warm part of the year, in summers, why, Dad would leave, oh, one or two o'clock

in the morning so he'd be able to deliver his produce prior to the time that the days became too warm for butter or an occasional pig or calf that he'd butcher. This was largely the source of their cash income. About 1895, the creameries were organized. And from then on, the so-called peddling of the ranch produce came to an end.

As for the early impressions and observations and so forth of the early settlers, well, I have very little comment. They got along well as neighbors at all times. Because there were some of the Mormons who did not go back when Brigham Young asked them to come back, some of those people were here. There were people from numerous countries of north Europe came in. But they worked together regardless of their individual feeling about their home country. It was never brought up in their business relations or anything. They came over and certainly decided to work together, and they'd do something worthwhile.

The property that Father acquired had been homesteaded by others, of course, knowing that those ahead of him had acquired earlier water rights that were on the bare land and unreclaimed.

I think the ranch operation in its early days revolved around just a small dairy and gradually increased. All of us, of course, had to take part. All of the boys had to learn to milk. But when the one sister came along, Mother insisted that she was not going to learn [laughing]. But Mother did help in the early life on the ranch.

About 1900 or shortly prior to that, Dad bought 640 acres of ground from the Occidental Land Company, which was the holding company, the landholding company, for the Newlands family; he [Newlands] later became the senator and was the author of the Reclamation Act. He, of course, was a son-in-

law of the Sharons who were part of the big four or five in Virginia City.

Dad was somewhat active. He took his political obligations very seriously. He, of course, filed for his citizenship papers as soon as he legally could do so, and I have often thought that perhaps citizenship papers were given in those days more by who the sponsors were than they were by actual examination. My own reaction is that it wasn't all bad to do it just that way. He served on the board of county commissioners for a number of years, and I think largely because there were people that had confidence in him. He was not an individual who sought to be in the forefront at all. He was a commissioner at the time that the Douglas County High School was established. The high school was opened in January at mid-term. The legislation called for the county commissioners to be an ex officio board of education until the next regular session, I suppose largely because they didn't want to hold a special election. But he did not seek further office other than when we had just local districts; he did serve on the local district school board.

My early indoctrination in politics was gained when some of the candidates came around. I suppose I was ten or eleven years old, and I remember Clarence D. Van Duzer, who was campaigning for Congress on the Silver Party. They had, I think, a four-piece band with them and had bonfires in the little now-extinct town of Sheridan. I always insisted on going with Dad because I enjoyed seeing these fellows wave their hands and call each other «thieves» Then on the way home, why (of course, this was in a cart or buckboard, and [it would] take several hours to get back to the ranch), Dad would always take a blanket along and I'd fold up and be asleep by the time that we got home.

I think probably one of the earliest memories that I have which I have retained,

and will, is when our home burned. I was four years old. It burned in such a hurry that the only thing that anyone had was what they had on them. I had been put to bed along with the little brother. And Irma, my sister, was just a babe in arms, you might say. But all at once, the fire started; how, they don't really know. But we got out, and I started to go back in, but just before the time that the house fell in, one of the neighbors came running through the house and picked me up. But the next morning, we didn't have enough clothes to wear for breakfast. We were taken to the neighbors in blankets for breakfast, and lived for a few days within a ramshackle cabin, you might call it, that was on the ranch, and then we moved with our uncle and aunt, and stayed there until the new house was completed. But, of course, people did help one another. Some carpenters were not working, and the neighbors hauled lumber; and the only source of lumber at the time was Carson, which meant with teams some twenty miles away. Others brought flour, and merchants supplied other things so that Dad and Mother could make a new start. It's still a wonderful recollection how people did help in times of an emergency.

I have not mentioned what our family consisted of. There were five boys and one girl. The oldest brother is William H. Settlemeyer of Elko, who was the county engineer there and, did private engineering work since 1917. The second oldest was [Edward] Ed Settlemeyer, who left the ranch and went into the sheep business, who is now living in Reno, has retired from the sheep business but is a member of the Nevada Tax Commission. I was the third son, and I'll have more to say of what my activities have been later on this program. The fourth, a son, his name was George. He passed away in 1915. He was due to take over on the ranch, and his death is

largely what put me in the operation of the ranch. And Irma, the only girl in our family, was next. She graduated from Mills College and taught school locally and in Reno for a number of years. The youngest member of the family is [James Theodore] Jim, who grew up on the ranch, but he definitely had no feeling for livestock. He was mechanically inclined, and eventually, when the time for college came, he took mechanical engineering. He is now with General Foods, and I think it's fair to say had much to do with the designing of the equipment with which Maxwell House makes their instant coffee. He's the chief engineer for the Maxwell House division of General Foods.

My own education, of course, began in the one-room school in the Fairview district on the south end of the Valley. At the time that I entered high school, there were no grades; we just stayed in school for so many years.

Young people of those days just had to make their own fun. I've often been asked how, by young people of the present, «Well, what did you do?»

I said, «We kept busy,» at either fishing or snowballing each other, or did whatever the season permitted you to do. But we certainly had to make our own fun. There was no one providing anything for us. And, of course, we had to take part in all types of ranch work as soon as we were able to do it. Our parents were interested in having their children have more education and better education than they did. They sacrificed for us any time.

From the Fairview district school, or the grammar school, I entered Douglas County High School, which was on the second floor of the Gardnerville District School. We started with one room. [When] they were able to give chemistry, which was my second year, why, there was just a small room. And the six or seven boys that wished to take chemistry

came into town on Saturday and helped the principal build tables and install sinks, and so forth. I rather felt that we got just quite a good course in chemistry, and I think it was probably due largely to the dedication of the instructor that we had, who was E. O. Vaughn. He later taught in Reno and later served as the city superintendent of schools in Reno. He was certainly one of my great lifelong friends until the time of his death. I completed my high school education in that building. All classes were taught in three rooms. This was the Douglas County High School.

We were always busy. When we couldn't do anything else, my brothers and I became really interested in the mountains, and we did a great deal of hiking in trying to climb all the highest peaks in our area. There's a great deal of enjoyment and a great deal of satisfaction in looking back.

I think it might be worthwhile to drop back a bit and talk about the grammar school and what was taught and what happened. There probably were twenty or thirty children in this one-room, one-teacher school. Discipline was not always the same. Some of the teachers seemed to have a feeling of being afraid of the youngsters, for which they possibly had some reason. And others were at that time, I thought, a bit severe.

Shortly after I got out of high school, I took a job almost immediately, shipping produce out of this valley to the mining camps. The company that I worked for at that time was known as the Carson Valley Hay and Produce Company. We shipped hay to Virginia City, to Tonopah, Goldfield, to Luning and Mina, and other small camps. This hay was used for horses hauling ore to the mills and whatever transportation was needed in those mining camps. My recollection is we shipped as high as eight railroad carloads of hay out in one day. I believe this was the

maximum shipment that I made. This would amount to about 125 tons.

After two years of that, I decided that I wanted to go on to college, which I did. I attended Gettysburg College in the 1914-15 school year, came home and put in the summer on the ranch and went back. In the fall of 1915, in October of that year, my younger brother passed away, and I was asked to come home. I had plans of doing something else, rather than to be on the ranch. I suggested to my father and mother that I thought I'd like to see them sell the ranch in view of the fact that the older brothers had started on their own and weren't available. Of course, my parents had built it from nothing, and I realized that this wasn't what they would like to do.

I enjoyed Gettysburg. In fact, history was always my favorite subject, whether I was in grammar school, high school, or college. I assume that the fact that Gettysburg, being such a historical spot, helped draw me there. I enjoyed the teachers, made some friends that are still friends.

And I have a pleasant recollection. The head of the philosophy department at Gettysburg was a brother-in-law to Mr. A. W. Hesson of the Hesson Mercantile Company in Elko. The professor's name was Dr. C. F. Sanders. When Mr. Hesson came to visit them, why, I was asked over to their house, and Mr. Hesson and I had just a lot of fun trying to convince the people around their house that evening that we didn't bother with pennies. we didn't use pennies in Nevada, which was an absolute fact. Nothing was priced except in multiples of five at that time.

I also remember on my way to Gettysburg, the train stopped at Fort Wayne, Indiana, which was a division point on the Pennsylvania Railroad. I felt that I wanted to buy a magazine. I walked into the newsstand there.

I didn't have any small change with me, and I asked for the magazine and gave the girl at the counter a five-dollar gold piece. She refused to sell me the magazine since she had never seen gold money. I tried to jolly her into it, but absolutely no sale. And, of course, we didn't know anything about paper money. I still have a buckskin bag which my dad carried. It was made for twenty-dollar gold pieces.

I was planning on taking prelegal work at Gettysburg, and through the interest, or the kindness, of the president of Gettysburg that I got to know very well, I did have the promise of a junior law partnership with a very well-known firm if I would go on to Yale for my law work and move in. However, I have enjoyed the life that I have had, and so have no regrets. It was rather disappointing at the time.

That brings us now to the time after the death of my brother. I then stayed on the ranch. And, of course, ranch work was just ranch work. We did everything, whether it was irrigating or moving cattle. We did have a summer range in Mono County, California, which was some fifty or sixty miles away. We trailed the cattle; we did not have trucks, even to haul horses or horse trailers. If we had a horse on the ranch that we wanted at the camp, why, we'd have to ride him there. Or if we had a horse at the camp that we wanted down at the home ranch, we'd have to ride. That distance was right near sixty miles. I rode it quite a few times in one day and didn't feel that it was any hardship.

That brings us up about to 1916. By then we had all nationalities here in the Valley, but largely those from southern Europe—the Italians, and the Basques. And, of course, we always had our Indians. And I know very well that when my dad and his brother left Germany and landed here, had the Indians decided to put them to work to clear land, they would have gone to work for the Indians just

as well as they would for anyone else. In fact, all they were looking for was a job.

I recollect a little story that one of the old-timers told about how someone asked an Indian if he remembered when the first white man came, and the Indian said, «Oh, yeh. I remember when white man first come. White man come and run out all the Indian. Then pretty quick Dutchman come, he run out all the white man.»

But they worked. Certainly the Basques worked for the Germans, the Germans worked for the Basques; they were all on an equal basis. I don't feel that there was any clannishness among them at all.

The subject has been suggested about what the situation was here during World War I. There was some discussion, and those of German extraction were just looked down upon a bit for a while, but this was caused largely by the overzealousness of some, which I would like to call rabid patriots. There was no reason for it. There was no violation of any law, and no thought of sabotage among those people. And the people who had lived here for years were never suspected by any of their neighbors of [any disloyalty]. Time has proven that the activity of trying to indict some of these people was uncalled for.

I was not in the service. My oldest brother was. I was of age. But at that time, my father became ill, and the operation of the ranch fell to me completely. It was about as hard a job as I ever did, to ask for a deferment. But the local board gave it to me without my even asking for it. I was active in Red Cross drives and helped wherever I could, in addition to operating the ranch. Also at that time, there was a death on the Douglas County School Board, and I was asked to serve on this. This was in 1917. I served on that board for fourteen years. Of course, improvements began to come. A new school building had

been built in 1915, which at that time was a modern building. Of course, by now, we've outgrown that many, many times. We had teachers that came—some came from the midwest and were excellent teachers. We had many people from the University of Nevada. I believe that one of the most inspiring teachers that I had during my years in high school was a Miss [Beulah] Hershiser. She taught history and I just felt that she was a great person.

That brings us close to the time of the Prohibition era. Well, I remember a man who was an assistant U. S. Attorney at the time who lived here in the Valley. He said he was quite sure that the only place that you couldn't get a drink was the Methodist Church! And I believe this was [laughing] almost a fact. I do not recollect the exact words of President Hoover, but he said this was a "noble experiment," that certainly proved for all time to me that if you do not have public support for a law, the law isn't worth keeping.

World War II came along, and again, there was some talk of there being disloyalty in the community. But again, I must emphasize that it was largely talk around the bars, with possibly a bit of noise, and I think perhaps the same arguments that people would have about politics, which might be a bit heated. But as far as definite disloyalty, it existed, if at all, to such a *small* extent that I feel that at all times it should have—ignoring it would have been much the best policy.

I have been asked if I remembered the Prohibition era and the repeal. Of course, I was not a heavy consumer of liquor, but found that I could have it if I did want it, which was usually for a friendly social drink with someone that I knew real well. But the evening of the repeal, why, there were a number of us, possibly fifteen or twenty—the boys that sort of traveled together—who gathered at a home with three or four cases of beer. Of course,

not being a very good beer drinker, I had a good time just with the gathering. But we just took it as a matter of course, you might say. We hadn't really been dry, and it was almost as if the weather changed from a rainstorm to something else and just moved into whatever had to be done the next day and with no great excitement at all.

[Do I remember any raids by the prohis here?] Yes. I remember I think one, but it wasn't very successful. I remember a story that was told about a man that I knew who was moonshining over in the Mason Valley area. The prohis came in there, and this fellow saw them and knew who they were. He was a man of untold nerve. He walked up to them, and he said, "Are you looking for a still?" He said, "I have some sheep out here, and there's someone running the still out there, and he's causing me a lot of difficulty with my shepherders. And," he said, "if you want, I'll take you out there and show you where it is."

So, this fellow had a Hudson automobile, took them in it, and took them out into the hills, and he said, "Well," pointing at a certain spring, "now you go over there, and you'll find the still."

These prohibition agents got out and started to walk, about ten or twelve miles out of Yerington; [there were] about three or four inches of snow, where he left them. He kept on driving, and he drove over to where the still *was* operating and destroyed it, and drove back to town, and let the prohibition agents walk back [laughing]. This raised the ire of the prohibition agents. They eventually caught up with this fellow, but it was told with great glee for a while.

I mentioned sheep just a few minutes ago. We didn't have tramp sheep bands in here. I attended meetings of the Nevada Livestock Association, which was the predecessor of

the Nevada Cattle Association. I attended a few meetings during the time that the Taylor Grazing Act was set up and found them very interesting. Of course, there was much to-do about the so-called tramp sheepmen who would come from Idaho or at times from the San Joaquin Valley into the Mono County area without owning land, just living off of the area as they went. And, of course, they were particularly grazing on the so-called public lands of which no one seemed to have any control. Nevada people attempted to control it in their water law [Stockwatering Act of 1925]. If you owned the water, why, of course, you controlled the range in all but the winter months when there was snow. Particularly with sheep, you could move anywhere if you had snow; they did not need to have drinking water for the sheep.

I remember particularly a very, I would say, sharp and able Basque, when they were talking about it, they felt that allotments should be given on this land to those that they were near to. And this very successful operator said, "Well," he said, "what I wish you would tell me [is], how near is far." Because he came from Idaho, and he just—in other words, he just felt he was a little like Henry Miller, who said he never wanted very much; he only wanted what was alongside of him. If the snow was there, he always had feed. And so he felt distance was of no concern. They would move those sheep three and four hundred miles over the winter out over the desert and back again.

But I believe that the Taylor Act was of some help in controlling overgrazing. Not so much of the local interests, the people who had established outfits, summer and winter in the one locality, they were not the people that should be accused of overgrazing. It's the uncontrolled grazing of sheep that hurt the ranges, for which, of course, I feel there are

conservationists who are blaming the present operators unjustly.

I will go into a bit more detail on operation of the ranch, problems involved, and how we arranged our drives. Actually, making a cattle drive was just a way of life. But when you started on these drives, it meant early hours and long days. We always attempted to get the largest portion of our drive over with prior to the noon hour. This was particularly true on the spring drives. We usually had breakfast at 2:30 a.m., then got our beds rolled and onto the wagon, and were at the corrals or wherever the cattle were confined just as soon as we could see. In the spring of the year, of course, these drives were very comfortable; but in the fall of the year, when we moved out of the hills, which was usually near the end of October or the early part of November, we would often run into a storm. Arid, of course, most of the time, we did have substantial beds. But we'd have to sleep outdoors.

I remember one morning, having slept under an open shed, when we got out, when I was cooking my breakfast, it was six below zero. A few of the boys were rather vain and didn't feel they wanted to be bothered with overshoes. It stormed a bit the day before, and we built a fire to thaw our boots so we could pull them on. I'm afraid that I must say I was among the vain ones that wasn't wearing the overshoes [laughing].

Of course, on the ranch itself, to describe all the things, you could never tell what—there was no routine. And I have always felt that a large ranch operation was far more complicated than that of a factory, even though the factory or a business institution might employ many more people. But there was nothing routine about the ranch. You plan on doing something today that you were going to do tomorrow, and the weather

would change. It would spoil your routine completely. I have felt that the management of a ranch is more difficult than management of a manufacturing plant. Someone, whoever is there, must know whether the hay is too dry or whether it's too wet to be put into the bale or the stack. When you plant your grain or alfalfa, a frost may come along and destroy it, which certainly has happened to everyone who has been in the agricultural field for any length of time.

You have no control of prices. I think I should like to give an example. [Around 1931 or 1932], I sold cows for a cent and a half a pound, and they were good cows, weighing about 1,200 pounds. I sold bulls for three cents a pound. I asked the buyer why. This meat certainly is tougher; it isn't as good as is cow beef.

His answer was, "Well, you know, the meat is drier, and before we make hamburger out of it, we add fifty percent water. And it's good hamburger."

I have retained sales slips of having sold cows at two cents a pound, steers at three and a half cents a pound. And certainly, we were going broke, and we just wouldn't admit it, was all that it amounted to.

And by that time, Father had passed away. And I'd get downhearted and talk to Mother, and she says, "Now," she said, "just stay with it. The only place you can find it is where you lost it." [laughing] But it just showed how hardy the old early settlers were. And we had to be. It was a great feeling when we were able to pay off our indebtedness right off the ranch operation.

We had terrific dry spells between the years 1924 to '34. 1926 was not quite as bad; 1929 was dry; 1930 and '31 were very dry. We had received only about between twenty and twenty-five percent of our normal precipitation. That, plus low prices, made it a

very difficult time. Feed, of course, was very high. We had to buy hay. We paid eighteen dollars a ton. We took the seller's estimate of how many tons there were, and it was a matter of take it or leave it. Trucks were not available as they are [now]; you couldn't move feed. Feeds had not been developed.

It was during that time that we began to put new dams in some old, old reservoirs, reservoirs that had been filed on many years ago by some people; they were on the west fork of the Carson River. The rights had been acquired by the Alpine Land and Reservoir Company associates, and we purchased those. They had all had dams. I would not like to leave the impression that these were built in violation of, for instance, the federal rights that they acquired in 1902. These rights had been filed on and had been recognized as having a priority of 1895 by the federal government prior to their building of the Lahontan Dam. The associates were Mr. William Dressler and Mr. Fritz Neddenriep, the fathers of Fred Dressler and presently living William Neddenriep. But I suppose because I was the driest, I was the ramrod. I moved my bed into the mountains, and we reconstructed the old reservoirs that were on these lakes. And it was work that I enjoyed, I suppose largely because I knew that we would have greener crops thereafter, and better crops. I'd like to build those same reservoirs today with the equipment that we now have. Those reservoirs, they were all put in with horses, with horse scrapers we had, On the one there, we had fifty head of horses working on Fresno scrapers.

I will speak for a few minutes about the native wildlife of this valley. The only change that I have seen is that deer have increased, oh, certainly a hundred percent in the valley proper. As children, we never saw one. There were some deer hunters. They would cross

over to the other slope, over on the—. Well, Blood's where the deer hunters would go. Those people who found time and could afford to go would go with pack trains. But that's on Highway 4 largely, in the Pacific and Hermit Valley-area. But deer became very plentiful; they seem to be on the decrease. I at times wonder if there aren't cycles in them or if a disease gets among them just as it comes in on other livestock, because I know deer are just another form of livestock.

The rabbits, of course, seem to be on a cyclic basis. They're a scourge at times. And, of course, there was a time if there was a good year for rabbits, I can remember the Indians having rabbit drives would just move through a brush, sagebrush flat. But they're certainly still with us. Quail are more abundant; ducks probably not. However, again, I believe with ducks, we have the same situation that I spoke about with fishing, the pressure and the number of hunters there are. I think there are possibly just as many ducks killed today as there were in the early days. But they're killed by more people, and so the duck per hunter average certainly has gone down.

Time was when we didn't have insects because we had no problem with [the] alfalfa weevil. And we had no problem with many of the animal diseases. Perhaps if we'd built a fence around Nevada and had never permitted any in-shipments from other states, we probably wouldn't have them today. Certainly, I opposed the spraying, the use of insecticides on alfalfa fields originally, because I felt that when we killed the weevil, we would kill their natural enemies. However, I found out that if I wanted to grow hay for my cattle, why, I had to spray because they became so thick that you just couldn't grow alfalfa without spraying. The use of insecticide is done as a matter of necessity. It isn't as that people want to spend their money for it, but

they have no choice. You'd probably leave your fields lay blank for a few years, and perhaps the insects might lose their host. But you don't pay the taxes today on land by just leaving it lie idle.

[Why do I think that there is a problem now where there wasn't before?] Well, I rather assume that insects really, you might say, are bred and become thicker in warmer areas. I don't like to blame the automobile and the transportation for everything, but certainly, we didn't have insects, the same type of insects. We didn't have the same kind of noxious weed until transportation came so fast and so easily that you had people moving from all areas. In some cases, I think, for instance, what I felt was a very bad weed came, and this, I believe, came in with sheep. And other people feel that way. It was Canadian thistle, which is very hard to control. The streams carried some of it. The sheep came in from areas where there was this one; and on the Carson River, I think some of it came from California. They were at the headwaters of the river, and they began to grow at the headwaters of the river. And this, of course, with irrigation and water coming down, why, we had an infestation of Canadian thistle. We tried to control it; I don't know how. But I think it's so widespread that people just have to learn to live with it. But it's the movement of people and livestock and what have you.

At times, people wonder what has happened to deny them recreation possibilities. I believe that the streams provide the same recreation that they did many years ago. But, of course, to those of us who grew up here, we know all too well that, for instance, fishing is not what it was when we were boys. My reaction on that is that if we didn't have any more people on the stream now than we did then, the fishing would be equally as good. When I

was small, friends of my father's did drive out from Carson with horse-drawn conveyances, but I imagine we didn't see more than five or six—certainly not more than ten people from outside of the Valley on our ranch. The advent of the automobile, of course, changed all that. The pressure became so heavy on the streams that, of course, nature couldn't provide the number of fish. The spawning grounds are no different, but I must say that the drought years were certainly very hard on stream life. (The years I usually refer to as our worst drought cycle of my lifetime was from approximately 1924 to '34.) Streams became very stagnant. The fish were never totally killed off. With planting, why, fishing on certain reaches of the river has improved. But the native fish, of course, are gone. We no longer—but for a few occasional cutthroats that are planted, why, the fish today are all of another species, rather than the native fish.

MY LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES: 1947-1961

THE 1947 SESSION

That brings us about down to the legislative activities to which I was elected in 1947. Senator William Dressler, who had been senator from this county for twenty-eight years, passed away in September of 1946. Then a number of people in the valley, without my knowing about it, circulated petitions to petition the Republican central committee that my name be placed on the ballot, in spite of the fact that another man had filed.

I was called, or a call was placed for me. I was at the Dressler ranch assisting Fred Dressler in working cattle. We did not get in until dark, and there was no way of reaching us by phone. When we did get to the Dressler home, there was a call for me that I was wanted at the courthouse. I rode my horse to our own ranch, changed clothes, came to the courthouse without stopping to eat any dinner because the call apparently was very urgent.

The petitions had been started. They were insistent that I would accept; they wanted assurance that I would run. The kind of people

that they were, I just had to say yes. I said I would. I was elected, and my first session was in 1947.

There were quite a few old-timers there. I certainly felt that I was stepping into a large pair of shoes after the twenty-eight years that Mr. Dressler had been there. Of course, I had followed legislative processes somewhat, had been interested. Was quite an admirer of Governor Boyle. I have a copy of his valedictory address* that he gave when he decided to retire as the governor of Nevada in 1921, which impressed me a great deal. And I suppose I must say that the philosophy that he expressed more or less rang so true that I believe that it probably still affects my thinking today.

That year was a bit unusual. I was certainly a green hand, and I had no resentment that I did not receive any committee chairmanships. I worked on the agricultural committee, the education, labor, livestock. I sometimes

*See Nevada Tax Review (December, 1926).

believe that I probably knew more about the legislation that was being acted on *that* session than any session after that time, the reason being I had no chairmanship, and no real responsibility. But I knew something about *every bit* that came before me. I brought my bill books home, and the next day's daily file, and was prepared to either state why I was voting the way I did or why I was opposing. Just because I had the time, I think, I was perhaps something like in the present-day Congress, where they have staff assistants who do the research for them, I knew what was going on. I wasn't an expert legislator at that time, probably never was, but I did have some valuable lessons taught to me that year.

Of course, that was the year the "postwar reserve fund" still existed, and this was kind of a nuisance. This was established by a prior legislature for the purpose of having some money set aside that could be used immediately when the boys came home from World War II so they could give employment to the veterans of that war.

Well, of course, the economic conditions never got that bad. There was work to be done, but this money was laying idle, and some of the senators were jealous about it and [thought] it should be left there.

The economic recession did not occur. Unemployment was not a problem. The fund was being invaded for other purposes whenever someone had a special project which was not financed in the budget. We decided that—and when I say "we," a few of us that were working on the financial condition of the state—decided that it would be better to abolish that fund and transfer all of the money into the general fund so that it could be appropriated by the legislature to those projects that qualified. This was done.

At the same time, we found there were many special taxes, such as the cigarette tax

and others, where a percentage of the tax receipts were earmarked for administration of those particular acts. We removed all of those and found that somewhere in the realm of \$2-\$300,000 was lying idle in those funds unexpended, which, of course, was a credit to the administrator of those taxes. It could well have dissipated those funds and hardly anyone would have known the difference, because there was no auditing department in those early years. All of those were transferred to the general fund, and thereafter, appropriations were made by the legislature to take care of that enforcement and administration.

I think it would be appropriate to speak a little of my predecessor, Senator Dressler. I, of course, grew up on a ranch adjoining that of Senator Dressler. Senator Dressler was a man [who was] certainly unusual. Of course, having operated adjoining ranches and irrigating out of the same ditch and—and when shortages of water occur, why, of course, tempers flare, which it did between us. But I learned early that if you had an argument with Senator Dressler today, it was never carried over into tomorrow's business. And it was a very valuable experience. We might differ at times, but if anyone took after me, why, they also took after Bill Dressler. I, of course, was honored to follow him, and he had established such a reputation as being a member of the "bull bloc," which actually was, you might say, a coalition, because in that bloc were, I believe, almost an equal number of Democrats and Republicans.

I have been told that if one wasn't sure of just what they should do about a bill, they often looked over to Jack Robbins, who was a Democratic member of that bull bloc. (And Jack Robbins, of course, later became one of my own very close friends in the legislature.) But they would just look over, and if Jack put his thumbs up [gesture], why, it meant

vote “aye,” and if he turned his thumb down [gesture], why, they all voted no.

They were certainly members during the transition years in Nevada prior to the very rapid growth. I think they are entitled to their place in Nevada’s history. In certain areas, they may have been over-conservative. In Senator Dressler’s case, he certainly tried as far as they could make the money reach. He was interested in education and helped education. He was a very close friend, and Miss Mildred Bray admired him greatly. They were a hardy crew. And if I had been there during their time, I would have much preferred that I was on their side rather than to be against them [laughing].

I found Jack Robbins to be one of the fairest men. There were times when people felt that he might be receiving a retainer. But at no time did I ever feel that he did anything that would injure Nevada. He was a very able legislator. And he was highly respected. During the years that I was there with Jack Robbins, of course, the Republicans were in control of the Senate. He had referred the Assembly bills when they had been passed by the Assembly and came over to the Senate. He had referred those bills at a time prior, when the Senate was controlled by his own party, the Democratic [party]. We never for a moment thought, just because we were the majority party, that we would take the reference of the bills away from Jack Robbins. Normally, of course, the majority leader refers the bills.

I remember one time an instance when one of the Republican senators felt that he’d like to have a certain bill referred to a different committee, and I think there was a selfish purpose for wishing this reference. Jack Robbins referred it to the committee that I felt was entitled to the bill. But this individual made a motion that he objected

to the reference and made a motion that it be referred to someone else. Senator Robbins rose to his feet and said, “I have referred the bills in this house for I don’t know how many years. I would like to call for a vote on that motion.” And, of course, the vote was sixteen to one in favor of Senator Robbins. I enjoyed working with him.

Actually, I feel that the men in these legislative bodies are much like people throughout the state. It’s a cross section. For one reason or another, you become closer to some of those individuals, just as we do in everyday life. If you asked me why I’m a better, closer friend of this person than of another, I can’t tell you. And this is the way it is in the legislature. I became very close to Senator [Herman] Budelman. In fact, our friendship continues to this day. There’s many of those. But you get into a little group, and what makes the groups gather, I don’t know. But you have a certain four or five that are regular associates for lunch. Sometimes some of them want a martini before they have lunch, and some others did not. And so I think *this* helps groups form. And this is not in derogation of the other people at all. On an individual basis, I certainly worked closely with Senator Johnson. And, of course, then they move away. They’re no longer there. I enjoyed them while they were there—Duffin, Loomis, McGuirk—enjoyed some more than others [laughing].

I think it’s true that there are a few people come there and probably have quite a nice vacation with pay. Some do not have the desire to be on such committees as finance or judiciary or education. In my judgment, they certainly are the hard-working committees. And in addition to that, there are times when—perhaps this isn’t right, but if you do not spend quite a few years there, you just do not get the committee assignments. Of

course, there are times you might feel that the seniority business is something for the birds. I do not feel that way, because the people who are sent back by their constituents must have something. And seniority is broken, was broken in the Nevada senate, because when I became chairman of the finance [committee], there was one, a Republican senator, came to me, said, "Well," he said, "I have seniority, and I want to get on finance."

I thought for a moment it'd be rather unpleasant and I was going to try to evade it and so forth, and suddenly I said to myself, "Well, fellow, you might just as well get this behind you."

I didn't feel that he had the qualifications for being on finance. I shall mention no names in that connection. I said, "Well, I'm going to tell you, if I'm going to be the chairman of finance, I intend to have something to say about who'll be on from my party. So, if you feel that you have the horses, why, you take the entire committee. But other than that, I'm going to have something to say about it."

Of course, he backed away, and I got the man that I wanted, and he did not have the seniority that the other man did. But it was my humble judgment that he was a man that I could work with, intelligent, and the record of the other man was such a factor [that] I suggested to him that he'd be in trouble with his constituents. If he was on finance, or if he legislated for the state, he'd be in trouble either with the state or his own constituents, one or the other. And I says, "You're not going to be on if I'm the chairman." And so those things come up, just as they come up in everyday life.

Just circumstances placed me closer to Baker, Budelman, Cox, Johnson, and Lemaire. That was my first year. That was in my party. I was also very close to Robbins and Sommer. But again, this is just because we were working in the same field, you might

say, although I had no committee assignment, but they thought it was an oversight and that didn't bother me. But the people on the finance committee asked me to sit in on their deliberations, which I did when I had the opportunity.

Certainly—I was just certainly a green hand in that first session, and had very few sessions with the governor, with Governor [Vail] Pittman, but we got along very well. Fact is, I think there was more camaraderie in the first—oh, in the early sessions, because whoever was a Republican was a Republican; whoever was a Democrat was a Democrat. But my own reaction was that about the first four or five sessions, why, we generally forgot whether we were Republicans or Democrats after organization. We certainly never voted that way. There was no one cracking the whip at all. I had eight sessions, or more than that, counting the special. There seemed to be a certain sadness of breaking apart at the last night of the session. Sometimes they used—as I say, they worked nights (and I abhorred that). But it'd be two or three o'clock in the morning, sometimes, before we'd get out of there.

THE 1949 SESSION

Well, now I'll talk about the 1949 session. Of course, that session, I became a member of the finance committee, and the other members were Senator Lattin, Senator Lemaire, Senator Budelman, and Senator Baker. They were all capable. I probably was closer to Senator Budelman than the others; however, I worked closely with Senator Lemaire and Senator Lattin. In fact, Senator Lattin's health was not good, and I remember distinctly that we weren't making very much progress. We did not have the facilities of the budget director's office. At that time, Bob Cahill, who was the

secretary of the Tax Commission, had perhaps the best information of state finances. Things were rather quiet, waiting for appropriation bills to be prepared. We had several very snowy afternoons that Senator Budelman and I retired to Bob Cahill's office, and in a matter of about two days, we came up with the appropriation bills. It was a very rewarding experience to have worked with Mr. Cahill and Mr. Budelman who had served on the finance committee for several sessions prior to the time that I joined the finance Committee.

As for the other members of the finance committee, Senator Lemaire had had a heart attack. So he couldn't be there, and Senator Lattin was ill. And so perhaps—I suppose this could be questioned, whether this was the proper way to do it—but I think we accomplished our ends, and apparently, the Senate was very glad that someone took over on the chore, and followed us almost without a question.

[Mr. Baker has been credited with doing so much for southern Nevada.] Senator Baker, of course, had just come out of the army. I got along very well with him, but some of the boys seemed to rather resent his military approach. And he was involved in southern Nevada problems, and was more interested, and, of course, had more problems to face than I did in my county. He was a competent individual without a doubt. Certainly, he did well enough for himself to prove that.

Some new senators came in that year—Senator Horlacher from White Pine, Senator Munk from Pershing, Senator Nores from Lincoln, Senator Strosnider from Lyon, and Senator Wilson from Mineral. Senator Munk joined the finance committee, and in my opinion, made a real contribution.

It is interesting that in the '49 session, it was recognized that Lake Tahoe was growing so fast that problems would arise. And SR5,

forming an interim committee on Lake Tahoe problems, was passed. However, it gave no authority, but discussions were started, which ultimately were resolved in what today might be termed the Tahoe Regional Agency, which hopefully will be worthwhile in trying to preserve Lake Tahoe.

1949 was also the year when livestock and people were isolated due to the unusually heavy snowstorms. This was particularly true in eastern and central Nevada. It caused a great deal of discussion. There were, among the legislators, opinions that the state should step in with a large contribution. However, after carefully examining the finances that were available and which had been accumulated in the Department of Agriculture, why, the thought eventually prevailed that this money which had been taken from the livestock people and placed under the control of the state Department of Agriculture was the proper source of funds for that. The livestock people paid for their hay. The state did provide \$25,000 for certain administration. But the money was all returned; it did not cost the taxpayers anything to feed the livestock. I remember that Governor Pittman and I were at a firemen's party; we were guests. And there was a little difference between Governor Pittman and myself in how it should be handled. There was no difference in what we were trying to accomplish. Governor Pittman felt it should be an appropriation from the general fund, and I took the position that the cattlemen should take care of themselves, which they did.

The hay was somewhere in the area. There were some large cargo planes. They loaded hay at the Minden airport on those planes and flew over the isolated areas and just kicked the bales out. And I certainly would have gone on one of those flights, but I just couldn't get away. But there were a number

of people, and among them, Fred Dressler, who flew over in those planes and helped kick the bales out.

[I didn't agree with any of the accusations of pinpoint bombing on those cattle?] No. I think they did very well not to hit more cattle than they did. But it was certainly an interesting thing to watch.

[What were the attitudes of some of the other senators from agricultural counties on this haylift?] They went right along with it. Of course, it gave training to the young fellows who were being trained to fly these planes and to drop the bales of hay, took the place of bombing, and then they were getting some very excellent training in the process.

The negotiations with the Air Force were handled entirely by the Executive Department. It was, of course, largely Governor Pittman. They provided, of course, the planes at no cost because they had to keep the young fellows flying anyway there. But this was—it was dusty. Those boys who got in there, flying with the doors open, why, when the hay went out, of course, they were just covered with hay dust before they got through. But I know Fred Dressler said that the boys weren't afraid to fly low enough so they could spot the cattle. It was very interesting to have been a part of it.

I believe that takes us to the '51 session where we had a topic here [in the suggested outline] of relationships with the executive and administrative agencies. And I just don't believe that I ever had any problem with the agency heads. I could always reach them.

THE 1951 SESSION

I think we are now ready to talk about the '51 session and, of course, the committees. I'm

not sure whether I was the chairman of the banking committee that year or not.

[The political writers said before the '51 session that the chairmanship of the finance committee was the center of a struggle between myself and Mr. Lattin, Mr. Lemaire, Mr. Johnson, and Forest Lovelock.] Senator Lovelock did not serve on the finance, and I don't remember very much of a struggle. The only struggle that I remember was my first session (1947) when there was a contest between Senator Tallman and Senator Cox for the chairmanship. And in the caucus, why, Senator Cox won out. But Senator Johnson, I believe he came into the 1943 session. He and Walter Cox had seniority. And during the entire time when I was in the senate, Senator Johnson just won, you might say, without any contest, the chairmanship of finance up until the time that he was defeated in 1958. And Senator Johnson was a capable legislator. But the membership, there were certainly—Forest Lovelock had qualifications for being chairman of finance, but others had served and they had seniority.

And no one yields, because I can tell you, when you get into—as I was told at my first caucus, that a caucus was not a Sunday school picnic. You played for keeps. And if you desired something, usually, you didn't say, "Well, oh, no, you take it." As they often say in the legislature, if you "had the horses," why, you're going to take the position. And certainly, on the whole, I found out whoever lost was always a gracious loser because it's the only way that you can—you have to forget that tonight's or today's battle was in caucus, and just be thankful for the assignments you did get. And after you have so much seniority, why, it is a good bet to say what you want and what you can get.

I believe in '51, we had a very bitter battle on the savings and loan legislation, on savings and loan association measures. Nevada at that time had a man who was very capable, who was operating a savings and loan association in Las Vegas, but he was not above trying to get self-serving legislation through. We spent long hours. It was at that time I was grateful for some of the legislative representatives, sometimes called lobbyists, for the help that they gave.

It was an all-inclusive bill. Included in this bill was also provisions that took care of title insurance and so forth, and neighbors couldn't've sold their house to each other without going through a broker, even though they were in complete agreement. We were able to keep this desired legislation from passing; it was amended. And the provision that this man particularly wanted in the bill was deleted. After that, why, the man decided to move to California, and he was very successful for a number of years in a very large savings and loan deal, but got into real difficulty just within the recent past. I believe I would prefer not to mention his name. Anyone in finance would know exactly who we're talking about. His stock was removed from the New York Stock Exchange by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Of course, this '51 session followed one of the very devastating floods that the area had seen. Money was appropriated for cleanup. Also, we began to plan for the Centennial celebration of the first white settlement. We have the subject of lobbyists here again [on the suggested outline], and with rare exception, I found them to be helpful. Of course, you had to make up your own mind as to whether they had an interest in what they were representing or working for, and we didn't necessarily go along with what they suggested. But at all times, they were more helpful than damaging.

I'll have to turn back, but I believe that the acquisition of Basic Magnesium came up in the '47 session. It may have been completed in '51. We were beginning to negotiate for it, and it appeared to me that if Nevada did not act, it would be sold to junkies, and it would have been hauled away. I remember very well at a Republican convention (this was a state convention) someone got up and was going to be critical of this acquisition and was criticizing the Democratic administration, which, of course, was under Pittman, for having the state go into [the] private business of owning property. Well, at no time did the legislature intend the state to operate or to hold it. And at that convention, I opposed this motion, saying that I thought it was something less than good judgment to be critical of the state acquiring that. It did not cost the state anything. We *did* have to pay, or guarantee, \$4,000,000 for it.

[What did I see as the Mueller-Biltz role in this Basic Magnesium affair?] Well, Mueller, of course, represented General Services Administration. If there was any hanky-panky about this—and which was rumored—I did not know of it. All that I do know is that, by the state acquiring it and keeping it from being junked, that American Potash came in, Stauffer Chemical came in and acquired a portion of the plant, Titanium Metals, and there were others. But in retrospect, I would say that the people who managed to save this for Nevada can be nothing but proud of it. If it had once been pulled out of the state and sold, it would have been sold for a pittance. I'm sure it would've gone to junkies, and we certainly would not have the industrial complex in southern Nevada that we have.

[What kind of rumors of hanky-panky did I hear?] Well, I heard that Mueller was

supposed to have gotten something out of it. I just don't believe that Mueller needed it or that he accepted anything. [And it was rumored] that some of the large companies got a bargain, and so forth. I think this is just standard for any deal of that size. There's somebody always ready to point a finger at any kind of a deal, because it was certainly a big deal. If anyone knew different, why, I think they were derelict in their duty in not bringing it to the surface. Certainly if I had known of anything like this, that there was something being gained by an individual, I would have been critical of it and would have said so. So whether this is true or not—and certainly anyone in the position of John Mueller, you'd have someone gunning for him.

Just as in a few instances where people made comments about me, certainly in connection with some banking legislation at one time, that I had a personal interest in this, and that's why I opposed it. I did walk into the governor's office one day. He had a group sitting around, and I said, "Well, I understand that this is—that it was said that I have a personal interest in it. And I want to tell you here and now that I can look every damn one of you in the eye and say, 'Go jump in the lake!'" Because I did have—owned—perhaps I was cutting it too fine. I did have a little stock in Bank of America, and when I became a member of the banking committee, I immediately sold all the bank stock that I owned because I wanted no conflict of interest. [It was] to my own detriment because the stock moved up, of course, during the time. I've often thought in that connection of a very good friend; he was a judge over in Alpine County, California. The day that I was first elected, or a few days shortly thereafter, Judge L. T. Price came to me and he said, "Well, Fred, I'm sorry that I wasn't voting in Nevada so that I could vote for you. But

if you'll just remember that you're going to live a little longer with yourself than anyone else in this world, why, you'll get along." And I tried not to forget that. He was a very close friend of mine, and just had kind of a fatherly interest in me. I was young compared to him.

[In this same '51 session, there was the "Right-to-Work" petition. Did I want to comment on that? Yes, I believe that is what labor took the position on. Those of us who supported it, [I] think the following morning—I don't know how they ever managed to get handbills printed as fast as they did, but every one of us had a—this was called the "yellow dog" bill—every one of us who supported it, why, of course, had one of those fliers on our desk. Of course, we were not impressed by it. We did what we thought was right. I did have some friends among the union-labor people who told me of the circumstances where the business agent had been wholly unfair.

In fact, a direct example was about two brothers who were members of the union came out from Reno and reshingled our house, and we got to talking about it, and they said they, on a Saturday morning, they were shingling a house in Reno. They were getting absolutely nothing for it, and this woman could not afford to have paid anyone for it. The business agent happened to come along—and I wouldn't be sure of the figures—but they were immediately fined either twenty-five or seventy-five dollars apiece. And there were a few instances like that. And they were supporting the Right-to-Work bill. This is the rank and file of union labor. If this were not true, it would have been defeated, because I believe this was referred under a referendum, was referred back to the people three times. And the rank and file of labor supported it. And, of course, labor leaders tried several times to get something to override that, just

by manipulation of the law. But they were not successful in the legislature, either. And they just quit trying. They realized that their own people were not supporting them.

[There was a controversy over Jeff Springmeyer's role as legislative counsel. Would I like to comment on his contributions to legislative efficiency and his own activities there?] Well, actually, I think it's something of a tempest in a teapot. Jeff had the unfortunate, if you want to call it a failing, of perhaps being overenthusiastic with things that he felt were proper. Jeff was an excellent research man. I contacted him often. But it was largely a personality clash. It was difficult, apparently, for him to work with others. But the information that he gathered was very good. I found that, oh, in a few cases on audits and so forth that he hadn't thought it through completely or didn't realize. Jeff and I continued to be good friends. Of course, he submitted what was known as the Gorvine report. The thought was to have, my recollection is, seven counties in the state. Certainly that was not acceptable at that time. Looking back, and in view of reapportionment, why, the things that Mr. Gorvine suggested would probably be a fact, although the legislation wasn't passed. But it would [have] been impossible at that time to've gotten it through the legislature. And I don't believe it would've increased the efficiency of government. Certainly I don't recollect all the details of it at the present time, but even though it had been good, why, it was just politically impossible to pass that. But there were personality clashes, and there were two sides to the story also.

I have never been enthusiastic about line item budgeting. There were areas perhaps where it was necessary. Because when we began talking about it, we found agencies

that did have the desire to spend their entire budget. And we found where in one agency, I think they had a paper supply stacked away that— it was estimated—would carry them for seven years, just so their budget would be spent.

I believe that Dr. Love was the president of the University. And I was getting very tired. And I think I was beginning to have a little authority in the finance committee by that time. And I suggested to the group that we give the University what money we could afford to give them. Because if you only have so much money, it certainly becomes the duty of the finance committee to apportion it. You may think there's need, but if you can't satisfy that need, why, you just can't give them the money. But I suggested to the group, I says, "Well, the way that our finances are, I would just like to try to give the University all the money that we think we can afford to give them without injuring other departments," which we did. And I think from that time that we had less complaint from the University by so doing than we did any other way. Of course, this was prior to the sales tax, and we didn't have money to go around. We were limited on bonds; the assessed valuation of the state had not been growing; we didn't have any room to issue bonds. We were limited to one percent of the state's assessed valuation. We had crying needs certainly at the mental hospital and at the prison. But I was pleased with the lump sum appropriation. And I still feel that way. Actually, I never wanted to be a regent of the University and a member of the legislature at the same time. I didn't want to go into the details of whether this was right or that was right. I felt this was a responsibility of the regents, and if the regents were not doing a good job, why, then it would be up to the people of the state to change the regents. And I disagreed with people who wanted to

investigate the University from the legislative standpoint, and was never interested in that. Costs have gone up; everything has grown. Of course, there's been more money available. The University has been growing, so I don't know whether we could still appropriate that way or not.

I feel the same way about other agencies. I believe when you line item, why, an agency, be it the Department of Education, be it the Division of Natural Resources, they might be planning a worthwhile program, or they'd feel it was a worthwhile program; and then when they'd get into it, they'd feel they should be doing it some other way. So they can't abandon the program. I think that the agency head should be responsible enough. to make that decision, and if he isn't able to make an intelligent decision, he should be removed completely. I've run into instances in the Department of Education. I've run into it in the Department of Natural Resources. And I was about ready to take a position even though I was no longer there, and discourage it. But I probably won't do that until I'm deliberately asked to do it. So that's my position on it.

Since I have introduced this topic of agency heads, I would like to discuss the relationships with these agency heads who come and have the hearings before the finance committee. Their approach makes a great deal of difference. If a man comes in with a chip on his shoulder and is antagonistic, of course, he has a more difficult time. But I think legislators are—most of them overlook that. If he justifies what he wants to do, it's given consideration. And, actually, the record has a great deal of influence on that. When we found an agency that was starting a new program, attempting to start a new program, the new programs were *always* looked at very carefully. I may

have some comment on this a little later, but perhaps we might just as well carry it through.

Just at this last session, the 1969 session, representatives of the University came to see me. They were having some difficulty with a program. A severe cut had been made in the University budget, and it affected principally the school of agriculture. I felt they justified their position to me, and with the help of Mr. Knisley, we were able to restore that cut.

It has happened in a few other cases. Someone, in one manner or another, a legislator, will be piqued, and an arbitrary cut is made. But quite often, with the proper approach, it can be restored. It's just a human relationship, is what much of it is.

I believe, generally, Dr. Love was more acceptable [than his predecessor]. And certainly, I had to say no. Quite often, why, some of the education bills and bills affecting the University were just left for me to handle. I can remember [a] more recent president, Armstrong, who came over and I had finally suggested to Dr. Armstrong, I said, "You know, I'm going to do what I can for the University. But your being here every day is going to make it more difficult, because legislators soon—or, the opinion is, if there's someone there hounding them too much, they feel that they aren't very busy at the job they're hired for, and just positively resent having someone who's desirous of an appropriation just," as the saying is, "looking down their neck." And I told Dr. Armstrong that I thought he would do better if he'd leave it to us to do what we could, because there's no one out to crucify anybody.

But certainly the finance committee has rather a heavy responsibility in distributing the funds that are available. And the revenue is just limited to so much. You've got to work within that, unless you know that you can pass

another revenue measure. And this isn't easy to do. So I believe that about suffices.

[The president of the University is probably a representative agency head. Other agency heads in the same position would be told substantially the same thing?] Absolutely. Yes.

I think the Department of Natural Resources, which includes the state engineer, of course the Division of Water Resources—I have been close to certainly all of them, Hugh Shamberger and all of them. But the Department of Natural Resources, or formerly the state engineer, they came in with rather a realistic budget. If they had funds left, it was reverted. And that type of performance seems to be appreciated by the legislature.

I remember specifically at one time when we were involved— and by we, I mean the state of Nevada—were involved in the Colorado River suit. Mr. Shamberger felt that he could get along with a certain amount of money to defend that suit. We in the legislature felt it was an awfully poor place to be short of funds. We increased the amount for the defense of the Colorado River involvement, and all of it was not used. At the next session, some of it reverted. I think historically perhaps that agency has come nearer getting what they ask for than any other agency because, of course, they certainly are the protector of the state's natural resources. I think there's some reason for that. But they have been doing a real good job in justifying their expenditures. [Then it's because of the conservative leadership from people like Mr. Shamberger?] Yes. Mr. Shamberger and Mr. [Elmo] De Ricco, and certainly now Mr. [Roland] Westergard presently as the state engineer heading up the Division of Water Resources. I found them to be very responsible. Of course, perhaps I

also know more about that field than I do of education.

I think I probably had more difficulty with the Welfare Department in getting them to justify their budget than probably any other. I remember distinctly that for some number of years, I opposed the ADC program, or the Aid to Dependent Children. One does get a little tired of championing a lost cause, and I finally told Barbara Coughlan one day in [a] finance committee meeting, "Well, Barbara, I have opposed this for quite a while. I think it's going to be a fact, and I'm going to stop opposing it. But prior to the time that I approve of the program, I must tell you that I believe that we're going to find that it'll put a premium on illegitimate children."

Barbara Coughlan said, "Fred, you mean to tell me that there are women who will have children to get another thirty dollars a month?"

And I said, "Precisely what I mean."

There was a woman from Reno who was very enthusiastic in lobbying for the program, and just several years ago, we happened to be at the same place, and she came over and said to me, she says, "I hang my head in shame. You were so right when you made that statement, and I remember it well."

It was just a little hard for me to be gracious, but all I said was, "Well, Mrs. _____, I'm afraid it's too late." And certainly, I think I have the same compassion for unfortunates that anyone has. But I do not think the program has been an unqualified success by any means, because I knew too many people—it was the abuse of the programs that I objected to.

Mrs. Coughlan was very qualified. And I never held it against her to be enthusiastic for the program that she was responsible for. I think the head of every department should be, or they shouldn't be holding the job. But I

felt that you needed someone whose emotions couldn't be appealed to as easily as Mrs. Coughlan's. I think anyone administering a program like that has to look at the facts and be able to take a position. She was certainly an able advocate for her cause, but I don't like to say that it should be headed by a man, but I say by someone who would be actually more realistic. And this meant being sometimes less than polite in handling the program, and have the ability to say *no*.

I could expand on that a little. Well, I was told of what happened during that time. I *understand* it's being more carefully watched, but in southern Nevada, the welfare agency of one of the major churches in the state followed the state's caseworker there. And when they got into where the heaviest case load of the ADC program existed, there'd be a group of children playing in *this* yard, or near *this* house [gesture], and before the caseworker could get into the door of the next house, these youngsters would be over at the next house. And it was situations like this, and I was told this by certainly an individual whose reputation and his interest in doing the right thing would be unimpeachable. They suspected this was going on. And, of course, a number of cases arose where—but the abuse continued. So at times, I thought Mrs. Coughlan was prospecting for cases and accused her of doing that, and she denied it [laughing].

[In this 1951 legislature, Governor Russell mentioned in his charge to the legislature a number of problems about the land and the depletion of state lands that had previously been for sale. It became a bit of a scandal.] Yes, there was. The only thing that I would say is, I believe that it was wrong for a state official to be involved in it. I, of course, was in no position to prove anything. It may or may not have been illegal. It was something less than

doing the right thing by the state. I don't know what could have been done about it. But, of course, the office of Surveyor General was abolished, and the Division of Lands was set up in the Department of Natural Resources. And there was certainly some justification for it. It should have been caught prior to the time that we had a change in administration. It was either dereliction or oversight on the part of the administration while it was going on. But I don't think it serves any real purpose to discuss it, except to say that it was wrong. And details, I'm not familiar with.

I do feel that there weren't very many of the members of the legislature—there were a few were in on it and benefited by it, but there were only a few. And I' also know many of them would have refused to've been a party to it; such men as Budelman and Lattin and so forth would not have been a party to it, even if the opportunity arose.

THE 1953 SESSION

Well, I think the '53 session was just a normal session. It became apparent that our population was increasing, of course, and this is when we began to plan for the sales tax.

[There was also Governor Russell's presentation of his budget, presented in a different way this time for the first time.] Well, in my own opinion, it was something new. In my own opinion, the legislators could have accepted that budget as written and passed it and taken care of what few other problems there were. And by and large, I found that they might just as well have taken the budget officers, ever since then, and passed it because so many portions of the expenditures that the state makes are by formula, certainly all the matching funds where there are federal funds involved. Why, there isn't anything you can do

about it. Your apportionments to schools are by formula. And certainly this has been true since '55, after the acceptance of the Peabody report, that the people look at the budget, and they just don't have the time, except just a few people on the finance and the ways and means committee go into it. But I feel that committees spend needless time, and they did even after I was the chairman, in trying to see where they can cut. Usually, the people who are critical of it are the people who want to cut without knowing why. They just feel it's too big and too large. But I felt it was a great help, and I was not one of those who felt that we were handed "Sears-Roebuck catalog." Actually, it was a help to have gotten it. Imperfections, yes, but I think imperfections that any human being would be apt to make. I think budget officers, even to the present, feel that they have better control with line items. I'm not entirely in agreement with that.

[It was this session, also, that put the state on a fiscal instead of a calendar year basis. What was my thinking on that?] Well, I think largely because I believe that the federal government operates on a fiscal year, and I feel that you have better fiscal management when they coincide. Also, I believe that the state knows better just what—they can get the feel of what's happening in the state on a fiscal year rather than a calendar year. But I think it was largely the desire that we were running on the same [basis]; with the amount of federal funds coming into the state, why, it was an improvement to go on to the fiscal year. So I think that's about all.

[Governor Russell brought up an issue of gambling control, asking for elimination of racehorse books.] I agreed. Certainly, I never understood gambling and the virtues of not having this or having it. But I feel that Governor Russell's position was right on it.

I believe that Senator Robbins probably knew more than any individual about what was desirable and what was undesirable in gambling. My recollection is this was the position of Senator Robbins. I also remember that Senator Robbins was violently opposed to dog racing. He felt it would add nothing to our economy and would increase our problems a great deal. And on the whole, I followed Senator Robbins' judgment on gambling issues.

[Do I think that there was an awareness in this session of educational problems building?] Very, very definitely, because quite a few of us were aware of it before. But we didn't think the climate was right to start trying to pass a sales tax bill. And I remember distinctly talking about it to [Harold] Butch Powers who was the lieutenant governor and president of the California senate. And we were, oh, just rather lightly joking each other, and Butch Powers said to me, says, "Well, Fred, you are going to find out that whenever your population increases above a certain percentage within a given time, you will have nowhere else to go."

And then when Maude Frazier, who was certainly a distinguished educator, told us that there were some—I wouldn't want to be held to the figures exactly, but I believe she told me there were eight thousand trailers in Clark County, and they averaged 2.3 children per trailer. Their assessed valuation was just very, very minimal. With information like that, we decided that there was nowhere else to go. We weren't prepared to move on it in '53. But there was [a feeling] among the realistic-thinking legislators that we knew we had to begin to move. And, of course, this is why in 1955—. We realized the need in '53, but felt that we should go in '55—which we did.

Mention has been made of the legislation creating the Oil and Gas Conservation

Commission [1953]. This came about by reason of the discovery and a rather small production of oil in this state. But, I believe that production of oil is classed as a mineral, and taxation will be on the same basis as minerals, of net proceeds. Of course, everyone was anticipating an oil boom in Nevada, that you could put gold roofs on all the schools and a few other things. That, of course, has not happened.

During this session, why, we had new members join us— Black from Humboldt County, Frank of Nye County, Gallagher (of course, “Senator” precedes each one of those names), Senator Orr, Senator Seevers, Senator Whitacre from Lyon County. Perhaps Senator Gallagher was, we might say, unusual because he was well along in years but had the enthusiasm of youth and had a great interest in young people, a hard worker, and a delightful person to be with.

I personally became very fond of Senator Orr who represented Lincoln County and enjoyed working, and as years went by, worked very closely with Senator Whitacre. My relations with all of them certainly were everything that one could ask for, and when I do not mention them, all their individual qualities, certainly it’s not in derogation of any one of them. There wasn’t a single one of those that ever really took a partisan position on legislation during that session. I felt that we were just a team.

Personally, and certainly in the early days, I was a Republican until the session opened. Most of the people were on that basis. And this was, I think, more true in the early sessions, and I’ll probably have some observations on this in some of the later sessions. But we were never grouped on a party basis when we went to lunch. In any gathering, why, there’s five or six people who I suppose the kids would call them “against,” but you’d just have your—it

becomes habit. Unless there’s something special arose, why, the same five or six people were always at the same luncheon table. Those that enjoyed a martini, that was another set. Those that didn’t, why, it happened to be another set. But we worked with them all. And I happened to be with the set that didn’t have a martini with their luncheon [laughing].

THE 1954 SPECIAL SESSION

On the ‘54 special session—of course, this was largely education problems, as I remember it. We began to really sort of put a dent in our general fund, trying to help out, but we couldn’t do enough. I think that ‘54—that was the main reason for calling the ‘54 session, just to wonder what could be done.

[What did I think of Governor Russell’s naming of the school survey committee?] I felt that was well done because the people that he appointed involved many of the heavy taxpaying people. And I thought it was *very* wise to involve those people. Of course, he had people from all segments. But it was highly desirable that he involved representatives of Kennecott, of the larger land interests, of the utilities, and those are the people that had to be sold on the deal, because they were the ones that would feel the effect of the new taxes. And I think it can be said that those people, after having served on the committee, were much more pliable in the needs of education. One of those individuals I knew very well. And he was just chronically against all taxes. But after having served on that committee, he certainly was ready to stand up and be counted for education. And I think if he hadn’t been identified with that school survey committee, he would have been opposed. I thought they did an excellent job. The formula that was developed by the Peabody group was an

excellent one; of course, it needed changing as conditions changed. But the overall principle of that, I believe, could have been used with slight modifications. If we hadn't had a few heroes who wanted to change for the sake of change, I think we could've continued to use it.

And the effectiveness of the special session: I happen to be one that prefers special sessions when the need arises. There is this to be said: the governor is in control, and you consider those things that are apparent. If you have regular annual sessions, you have the same introduction of bills; it apparently is impossible to hold it to a budget session. And I think the only way that you can control the number of bills that are introduced is to call special sessions. I also occasionally felt that perhaps in special sessions that are called, you should meet more as a committee of the whole, so that all legislators were involved, because it's obvious if they do not meet as a committee of the whole, if it's called for financial reasons, then it's only the people involved with the members of the money committees who work. Or if education, the committee on education might be involved. It would still leave quite a few people that wouldn't be involved. I have some mixed feelings on it, because at a committee of the whole, you have many, many people to satisfy, and also it's apparent to me that a smaller committee can work more rapidly. I still am of the opinion that special sessions are not bad.

THE 1955 SESSION

In 1955, why, I was given the honor of being president pro tem. It was not very involved, required few conflicting decisions. My recollection is we ran a bit overtime, but this was, of course, due to the financial bind that Nevada was rapidly approaching. And it

took, oh, some time to clear up the various ideas on sales tax and the opposition to it. [The] opposition to it became, I think, largely selfish—how it would affect one group and not affect the other, and whether or not it was regressive. Of course, we ultimately had to make the decision on that. And I think it's obvious—you could take a position that any tax is regressive. And I think you were just widening the base, and this was certainly the only way that we could go.

It was a very interesting discussion. The people who were in the western part of the state, who adjoined California, seemed to favor the California pattern of the sales tax. The people who were on the eastern part of the state approached it from the Utah plan.

We were meeting quite late one evening. We visited with some of the people from the eastern side of the state, and after listening to it, I became convinced that that was the way to go because Utah had had this base tax with no exemptions, and it was low. California's tax had exemptions. When we got through with the plan, why, I was sure that the Utah plan would produce the most revenue with the least cost of administration. And I turned that way. I did have some information on the number of auditors that [the] state of California had going *all* over the United States. Nevada would've had to do the same thing. The sales tax collection division probably would have cost what another cent on the tax would have added. And it's such things as in California, [I] found out that if a cookie had an icing on it, it was subject to sales tax. If it did not, it wasn't.

Of course, certainly, there's a big question of exempting food, or exempting unprepared food. My own position was that if you started exemptions, it would be never ending. When we started to pass the bill, our finance committee decided to go along with the Utah

plan, which was proposed by the Assembly, and they deserve the credit for bringing up the plan of no exemptions.

But that evening, a representative of the agricultural industry came to me and felt that farm tractors should be exempted because they would produce a product which would ultimately be taxed. A representative of another industry who used a great deal of coal for development of power and in a general mining operation felt that coal should be exempt. That was used to produce the electricity which produced something else, and should be exempt. And I don't know why, but I think the argument in support of the sales tax apparently fell to me. I was not the chairman of finance. But I told the representative of agriculture, industry, I said, "If we're not going to exempt food, we're not going to exempt tractors.." I told the representative of the coal user that if there were no exemptions, there were to be none. To a representative of the agricultural industry, I said, "You just go back and call your farm bureau president and [inform him] that you're not going to have any luck. You've been denied." I told the representative of the mining industry the same thing. I said, "This is a good bill, and we're going to pass it tonight because by tomorrow morning, why, the pressure'll be on, and we may lose it. So it's now or never. I just will not consider any—."

There are a few exemptions here written in that tie into California law. I think oil for heat, and I believe (I think it can be justified entirely) feed for cattle that are to be slaughtered, there isn't any sales tax. But feed for horses which don't ultimately reach the retail market is taxed.

I think it was received very well with the "no exemption" provision by retail merchants. A drugstore would have had an untold amount of trouble if drugs had been exempted. But,

of course, the way it keeps going up—and it would have gone up—we would have needed at least another half percent if we had started exemptions, and possibly more. I think that was the major accomplishment of the 1955 session.

There were two other things that came up in that session, like the Personnel Act and the centralized purchasing. I had some mixed feelings on the Personnel Act at the time; of course, events have proved that—just a few instances—the Personnel Act was needed. But perhaps I was in a little different position. I always felt that if I had a boss—and I did work for wages—who was unhappy with me, I would never want a law to protect my job. I'd just leave. But after you've given so many years to public employment, you certainly don't like to be put out just because you happen to belong to the wrong party. So although I think that it's been a worthwhile thing, I think there are times now when it's abused when people try to hold their jobs. It seemed apparent to me that agency heads didn't always advance their people on merit, but they were upgraded quite often when, if it had been in private industry, it wouldn't've happened. Perhaps it does happen in private industry the same way. But I don't believe that it happens to the extent that it happens in public employment. I believe, over the long pull, it was advisable to pass it. But at the time that it came up, I wasn't one of the enthusiastic supporters. But I did support it.

I think on the whole, I believe [centralized] purchasing has been worthwhile. You find that the human element comes into it, and the judgment of individuals. I believe prior to purchasing, in large items and agencies that use large, certain expensive things, I believe that there are places where they understand their needs better than the purchasing department does. I believe this

has happened, oh, in the University level in laboratory facilities. But [if] I'm not mistaken, that was eased so that they can do their own purchasing.

But when we started to work on that purchasing, central purchasing, why, we found that a secretary would be going to one store and buying a dozen pencils, and it was scattered all over the place; there was no control. There are some companies that object to the purchasing department, but I think that has brought about more competition. And I feel that the purchasing department has proven its worth.

[Did I know about any of the abuses that brought about a request for centralized purchasing?] Well, it was just various little things. One store'd sell a dozen pencils, or a certain number of tabs or pads of paper, and there was no rhyme or reason. And, of course, Nevada was consuming and needing so much more stuff in the way of tires, gasoline, fuel oil as the growth came along, that favorites were being played, without a doubt. It just depended on who you know as to who got the business.

[There were suggestions that certain people could sell cars to the state, or expected to sell cars to the state in return for political favors?] Yes. It was going on.

There was some discussion about the legislative commission in this session. I think some good has come out of the legislative commission. There was some opposition to it, but usually this was by members who had a desire to be on and weren't appointed. I never was on the commission. I had so many things to look after during the off session period that I never did have any desire. But I attended meetings, and when things of interest [were discussed] that I was particularly interested

in, why, then I would attend the commission and take part in the discussions. And I felt I was just about as effective as if I had had a vote, which I did not have.

In fact, with the recodification of Nevada's laws, without the legislative commission having the bills prepared for the repeal of certain sections, I'm not sure that it would ever [have] been accomplished, even though we had people working on it. But they were helpful and I wouldn't be one to abolish it at all.

Cliff Young was a congressman at the time. He introduced the legislation [for termination] of federal control or supervision of certain tribes. My attention was called to it by an Indian, and then I checked with various county officials. I was familiar with the [situation]. While there was no area of termination in Douglas County, there was in Ormsby County. I called the public health officer in Ormsby, called the county commissioner to ask *if* they were in a position to take over all the obligations of the federal government to the Indians, such as hospitalization and medical care. The reply was they absolutely could not. If the termination bill had passed without provisions for continuing [care], it would have been a terrific hardship on many counties. I found the same situation in Pershing County. I thought perhaps shortly thereafter, if this type of legislation is theoretically proper, [it] could not be absorbed by the Indians. So I was co-introducer of that resolution [SJR 13]. I had rather lengthy correspondence with Cliff Young. I had also rather carefully read the testimony that was given at the various congressional hearings. I could not find any unanimity among the Indians of what they desired. I thought often in the hearings answers were put in the Indians' mouth. It made me think of some of the discussions

that I'd had with them, as I felt like often they would say, "Yes, I don't know" [laughing]. And this is the way it appeared to me. So I supported that in the interests of the state. I do believe that the Bureau of Indian Affairs have waited on and cared for the Indians so they know no other way of living, and it's hard to break them from their habits because they've been probably overindulged at certain periods, rather than made self-reliant.

THE 1956 SPECIAL SESSION

The '56 special session was called to remove some conflicts in the new school code, also to remove a conflict in the absent voters law. I do not recollect what the difficulty was with the driver's license statute which was handled by a committee that I was not active on. There was also a resolution introduced to put food and drugs on the exempted list. It was my feeling that this was done largely for home consumption by legislators [who believed] that it would help them in the forthcoming election. However, this resolution was voted down. The resolution asked that the governor put it on the agenda for the special session. The resolution was defeated with very little fanfare.

[Do I think that the passing of the sales tax diluted the possibility of firm gambling control?] No, I do not believe that that suggestion was a fact at all. Because at the same time that we passed the sales tax, we also increased the gambling tax. We felt that without increasing the gambling tax, we couldn't possibly pass the sales tax. It was a story that was put out, but it had no basis in fact whatsoever.

We have here [on the outline] the observations on the session in comparison or in contrast with previous special sessions. I saw no great difference between this and

the previous special session which we had in 1954. And I believe that I have referred to this before, that I feel that special sessions, if there is reason to call them, are better than the annual sessions. I may refer to this again in a later comment on the one regular session that we had in 1960.

THE 1957 SESSION

That brings us to the '57 regular session. I think the highlight of that session certainly was the famous—or the infamous—Senate Bill 92. It consumed a great deal of time, and in my opinion, it was possibly the best, or if you will, the worst example of special interest legislation. That bill, of course, was passed by both houses of the legislature. The pressure was very heavy. It ultimately was vetoed by Governor Russell. And in a very tense session, the veto was sustained by the switch of one senator. Had that bill become law, in my opinion, the gamblers would have had—or I should say those engaged in gambling would have had far greater privilege than almost anyone in any other business. I would compare it to the insurance business. If an insurance agent abuses, or willfully does wrong, almost any other industry, certainly where they're licensed, their license may be withdrawn. If Senate [Bill] 92 had been upheld, why, the gambler had recourse to the courts. The only cause for immediate revocation was cheating. But there could be undesired—or undesirable—interests in the operation of a gambling casino, and they could be charged by the (then) Tax Commission with having undesirable elements around, or interested in the operation. They would have the right to go to court. They *could* continue to operate, and it certainly is a well-known fact that once it is in the courts, there can be motions to delay for an unknown length of time, possibly

interminable. It's to the everlasting credit of Governor Russell that he had the courage to veto the bill. And I must say the same thing is true of Senator Lattin when he switched from having supported the bill to that of sustaining the governor's veto. It turned powerful interests against both men. And it's probably not exaggerating to say that it caused the political demise of both men. I believe it was the most tense moment that I experienced during my time in the legislature. But then I was relieved to see the veto sustained.

[Would I discuss some of the pressures that were put on the legislators? The newspapers were very explicit about Marion Hicks and Clifford Jones being the ones who were trying to influence the legislation.] The bill was rather explicit in saying that it would not affect any case before the courts. So it was projecting it into the future. The fine hand of the people mentioned was evident. I was never approached by them. I knew the pressure existed. But I don't know why I wasn't; perhaps they felt it was useless. But it was apparent that the pressure was on, and I believe that a few of the legislators committed themselves prior to the time that they understood it, because a number of legislators told me afterward that, "Well, I've been trapped once. Before I say yes on a thing that is presented the way this was, why, I'm going to be more careful." [Some of the men who voted to override the governor's veto had voted in favor of the bill before; are these the ones I'm talking about?] Yes, they were. Yes, some of those that had supported the bill regretted that they had. But they had given their word that they would support it, but were glad that the bill was killed by reason of the veto.

I was being very active in finance, and I didn't follow the education bill. I followed the committee's report, and I do not remember the details without going to the Senate

journal. Well, I knew that Senator Crumley, who was also a regent, was opposed to the [McHenry] report in principle. But it just was apparent that it was going to pass, and, of course, then the legislature appointed the regents to increase the size of the board. But I do not have enough recollection to speak on that factually.

Then there was the adoption of the revised statutes at this session, which was the culmination of a number of years of work. Of course, that was highly necessary, that the Nevada laws be, you might say, recompiled. You had such things on the books as that an automobile had to give any team that they met the right of way on the road, and you could not drive over a bridge faster than twenty miles an hour, or possibly fifteen miles an hour. Many, many statutes needed repealing. And, of course, Russ McDonald did an excellent job of compiling. And the system set up in Nevada is now being followed by a number of other states. I've talked to many attorneys, and they're so glad that it's put out in the loose-leaf form, so when a statute is repealed or is amended, you can open it up and put the new section in. And it's kept up on an absolutely live basis. And attorneys tell me that it has, in fact, reduced litigation, because under the old compilations, why, one attorney would pull one thing, one law out, and the other attorney would pull out another section. And they hardly knew—and the judge hardly knew—which section he should follow. Today, with the compilations that Nevada has, why, I believe it's been followed by Arizona. They sent people up here to go over it, and a number of other states. And how far it's spread by now, I do not know.

THE SESSIONS FROM 1959 TO 1961

I think it would be well to mention here, of course, by the '57 session, we began to realize

that the sales tax would yield a substantial amount of money. And we on the finance committee adopted the policy of using some of this money for capital improvements. We also realized that in government— I believe it's the Parkinson's law, where expenditures in government equals the amounts available. So we knew that there was an urgent need for making capital improvements in various places. Prior to the time that everyone seemed to realize it, why, we would introduce bills to appropriate capital funds to such institutions as the University, the correctional institutions, because at that time, the assessed valuation throughout the state was not enough to issue bonds.

I'd like to refer to some notes that I made at one time, that between 19—well, I would say 1957—in 1955, you did not know how much the sales tax would yield. The first few years following, we would assume that the sales tax would yield the same as it did the previous year, because I think there is nothing worse in government than to overestimate your revenues. As years went by, we'd assume that we took a percentage increase, because the money committees in the legislature have to estimate revenues approximately a year and a half ahead. And I certainly never wanted to be guilty of overestimating. But from '57 to '62—and those are the years that I'm familiar with— why, we appropriated something like \$15 million to the University for capital improvements. This included buildings on both campuses, Nevada Southern as well as University at Reno. We appropriated some \$2 million to the mental hospital out of the general fund. No bonds were issued. We built the new complex at the School of Industry, costing \$1 million. We built the girls' training center at Caliente, costing some \$910,000, plus substantial amounts to other state government buildings. But we would put

these appropriation bills out early before the pressure was on for increased salaries here and there. We generally felt that our state salaries were in line with what they were in private industry. Of course, certainly everyone didn't agree with this, that this was the way to do it. But it was the *only* way that we had of providing these needed capital expenditures.

This became a matter of some considerable controversy in the 1960 session, when Governor Sawyer tried to hold out against this attitude. This, of course, came in the '59 and the '61 session; we did appropriate some money in the '60 session. And, of course, by that time, I was the chairman of finance, so I was really in the middle of it. And I had some very fine support from Democrats in this. I remember very well one morning, we were meeting in joint session with the ways and means of the assembly. We were considering the appropriation for the new engineering building. We thought we had the thing settled. This became rather a battle, I perhaps should say, between the executive and legislative departments.

In connection with appropriating out of the general fund for capital improvements, I am reminded of an interesting happening concerning the appropriation for the school of engineering at the University. At the close of the weekend, why, we felt that we were going to appropriate for the construction of the engineering building. Over the weekend, apparently a number of the regents of the University succumbed to the pressure of Governor Sawyer, that they would forego the construction of the new engineering building even though we had been notified that the engineering school might lose its status by the agency which accredits, whatever that name might be, if the new facilities were not built. This had been prearranged just prior to the weekend recess.

On Saturday, it came over the wire that the regents had succumbed and would settle for a nuclear reactor for the '60 year, with the understanding that the engineering building would be the first recommendation in the executive budget for the following session. There were those among us who were not sure that the funds would be available if we waited, and we felt there was an urgent need for this building to be constructed.

It appears to me to be appropriate that I give the basic reason for our moving on making capital improvements out of the general fund the way we did from 1957 through 1961. It became apparent to us that construction costs were rising very rapidly, almost ten percent per year. In other words, if there had been a two-year delay in the construction of the engineering building that we have just been talking about, the increased cost would have been in the area of \$250,000. During that same period, 1957 through 1961, the legislature appropriated more than \$20 million for desperately needed new construction. In my opinion, all other justifiable needs were also met. Let me assure you that there were other demands that the legislature did not feel were entitled to the same priority. I will always believe that the action of the legislature during that period saved the taxpayers of Nevada a minimum of \$2 million in direct construction costs. Obviously, if bonds had been issued for the construction involved, the cost would have been a great deal higher.

On Monday morning, just prior to going to the joint meeting of the ways and means and the finance committee, I met one of my good friends and associate on our way over to the meeting. This was Mr. Ray Knisley, a good friend then and now. He informed me that he had to stop at the governor's office, and my comment was that, "I suppose I'd have to break in the door to get in."

His comment was, "Well, haven't you been asked in?"

I said, "No, I have not."

His comment was that, "If this is deliberate, I think it's unpardonable. And if it is not deliberate, it's rude at its best."

However, he stopped there, and I went over to our joint session of ways and means and Senate finance committees, and I called for the consideration of the bill that carried the appropriation for the engineering building. We discussed it at some length, and [I] was then informed by a member of the planning board that it perhaps would not be necessary to appropriate all of the money at this time because construction could not be moved that rapidly. Mr. C. V. Isbell was chairman of the planning board at that time. I called him in Reno, knowing that he was very much interested in the construction of the engineering building. He informed me that an appropriation (and my recollection is that what we would need for this immediate year was \$1,800,000) would suffice until the next legislature met. An amendment was offered to place that figure in the appropriation. And it was moved that this particular bill be approved and carried.

And just about that time, Mr. Knisley walked in with a communication from the governor, saying that we could appropriate money for the building of the engineering school. I informed Mr. Knisley, who came in and sat down alongside me, and I said, "Well, Ray, this bill has already been approved, and action has been taken." I was rather sorry for that in a moment, but my temperature was still slightly above normal, and it could have been probably less embarrassing for him to have read his letter, or ask him just to sit down and not do anything. But it was an interesting interlude [laughing] in the legislative process.

And I might add that at the '61 session, one of the very early bills that

was introduced was one that carried an appropriation necessary to complete the engineering building out of the general fund appropriation. And Governor Sawyer decided not to oppose that.

[What was Mr. Swackhamer's role in this? He was the chairman of the assembly committee on ways and means.] I think Mr. [William] Swackhamer at that time was not in favor with the administration. Mr. Swackhamer was a very close friend of mine, and I believe was one of the hardest-working, and also a very fair-minded individual. He studied details of finances about as well as anyone. And he and I discussed the matter of the availability of this money. And certainly, again, he proved that he knew what he was talking about. He was certainly a great deal of help to me. With all the seniority that he had, why he was punished by, I suppose, for what may have been called his non-cooperation with the executive department at that time was beyond me.

[There were complaints about Governor Sawyer's dictatorial attitudes toward the legislature?] Well, I must say that the '59 session was perhaps the only session where there was just a strong atmosphere of partisanship.

The '59 session, of course, was an extraordinarily long session due to the partisanship that existed. Quite often, the Republicans just occupied their seats while either all of the Democrats, or at least the leaders, were in conference with the executive department. Even some of my long-time Democratic friends became unhappy with the way it was going. However, certainly on the gambling legislation, they stood behind the executive department, and a number of Republicans also joined them.

This was known as AB 144, which was a reorganization, taking gambling control away from the Tax Commission and setting up an independent gaming board. I was not too concerned about creating a new board. I was very concerned that there was wording in the original bill which said that the gaming board should be composed of so many people, preferably those who had experience in gambling. I also felt that that Tax Commission had done a reasonably good job, with the Tax Commission composed of people selected from various industries, because I felt that the people of Nevada had a better representation. This caused a great deal of maneuvering within the legislature, particularly in the senate. The assembly passed the bill almost as it was introduced.

Looking back, I think that I will admit that the feature of setting up a separate board for gambling was not bad. However, the way the '59 bill was written, suggesting that the board be made up of people who had experience in gambling, seemed to me to be the wrong approach entirely. But the bill passed. It was in effect as it was written until the '61 session came around.

Governor Sawyer, I believe, saw the potential danger in making appointments as suggested by the legislation. Governor Sawyer certainly had a desire to control gambling. He moved some people over from the Tax Commission over onto the gambling board, and had he not done so, and appointed people as suggested by AB 144, he would have been in trouble.

And I think I should, for continuity's sake, move over into the '61 session on this gaming legislation. By the time the '61 session came around, why, more members of the legislature felt there was danger in AB 144 the way it was passed. Early in the '61 session, one of the representatives of one of the major industries

(it was not gambling) called several of us to Reno and said, "What can we do about this?"

He said, "Well—."

And there were Democrats as well as Republicans; it was approached strictly on a nonpartisan basis.

I said, "Well, I think that we should go at this completely on a nonpartisan basis."

We pulled together what is known as SB 203. That bill, as it relates to the Gambling Control Board, pulled the words on the qualifications "preferably with gambling experience," and inserted the words that "the gambling board shall consist of (I believe) five members, not more than two of which shall be from any one industry." This, of course, removed the objection that I had in 1959.

At one of those meetings that were held on this, why, Governor Sawyer was included, and I remember so well this man. We were all just sitting around, visiting informally, and this man pointed his finger at Governor Sawyer, and he says, "Grant, you know you're in trouble with this. I don't need to tell you so. And I'm sure you're willing to do something about it."

He said, "Well, yes, I am."

So we pulled together SB 203 that I have just talked about. We had every senator's name on it. And, of course, it was introduced and passed and sent over to the assembly, and, of course, my recollection is I believe it was also passed unanimously. I know it passed the senate with a unanimous vote. I think it can be said that there's a certain satisfaction in having opposed the bill at one time, and then have your position approved at the following session.

But the '59 session was a partisan session, the worst that I experienced. I have worked under three different governors. In 1961, why, Grant Sawyer also became less partisan. But the Democratic leadership in the Senate came

back in the '61 session and said, "We don't want another session like the '59." So it was rewarding to've been a part of it.

I think in the 59 session I supported, was the introducer, of several other bills. I think they are worthy of comment. They were SB 289, SB 295. The bills were introduced, passed with some opposition to permit the Retirement Board and the Industrial Commission to invest their funds in other than state and municipal bonds within the state.

There were people who felt that these were funds that belonged to the state of Nevada. I took the position, and had support, that they were not funds that could be called state funds. In my opinion, they were and are trust funds. In the case of the Industrial Commission, they are funds that are acquired entirely at the expense of the employers. And the funds are in trust for people that they have on hand, are there for the benefit of people who have been injured in industry. In the case of the retirement fund, they are funds that have been acquired by contributions from both employer and employee.

In checking this, we found that forty percent of the Retirement Board funds at that time were invested in one county. Had something serious happened to cause a recession, or the county got into trouble, people who were beneficiaries of the retirement fund could have been hurt. I found that both parties were equally guilty because they were loaning these funds at rates substantially below what other sound investments could bring them. So by throwing it open, we were able to increase benefits to those people who were entitled to them without increasing costs to either employee or employer. We further believed that the fund would be much safer.

That particular year, many municipalities were unhappy because the funds of the

Retirement Board and Industrial Commission were no longer available. And I was called by the executive secretary of the municipal association to come and speak to this particular issue at their convention; [it] was held at Cal Neva, as I remember it. But I was also advised that I might be chewed on; I had better be prepared for that.

Originally, I had Mr. Marvin Humphrey, who was then in the assembly, working on this legislation, and he became involved in something else, and he turned his assignment over to Ray Knisley, who had a very fine background in investments. So Ray and I were, you might say, the accused, or the sponsors of it, depending on which side you were. So Mr. Knisley and I had come to this meeting with the state bank examiner, who was on the state board of finance and was in charge of some of these investments. He took the position that they had done a good job because no money had ever been lost. Mr. Knisley and I took the position that this was not state money; it was entitled to receive the same price that money that could be had on the open market, providing that you had equal security.

We found many of the people there, such as mayors and other employees and people working for these municipalities, were violently against us to begin with. And within an hour after the discussion was over, why, we had people coming to us and telling us how grateful they were. A man from southern Nevada said, "We just concluded you're right. After all, this is not state money. This is our money that they're playing politics with." we had the satisfaction of facing a completely hostile audience to one that was completely over on the other side before we got through.

Today, of course, I think the retirement fund has well over a hundred million dollars in it. The industrial fund is substantially less,

possibly twenty or thirty million. But, of course, the price of all investments, the yield from investments, has gone up. They invest in very, very little common stock. We advised against this. The legislation also included the provision that they could select investment counsel, which they have done. But within a year, why, the yield of these trust funds increased, I think by one percent. And when you're talking of something that's approaching \$150 million, why, you're talking about a substantial return. I believe I have gotten possibly as much satisfaction in handling that legislation than anything else.

We've sort of combined the '59, '60 and '61 sessions. But you have to put things into context as you see them. I feel when it relates to the same subject, why, I believe in compiling it together.

The civil rights legislation, I think, probably brought about more heat than light. I suppose by background training, I am not an ardent advocate of much of the legislation that has been passed. I think I knew what it was to be a member of a minority group because I think I experienced it when I was a child. I was often pointed at as being a "Dutch kid," and so forth, by the children whose parents did not have a European background as close as I had. All of us in our family rather felt that. I have had some fine friends of minority groups, both among the Indians and Negroes. There were times when I felt that everyone should be satisfied as long as they were measured by the same yardstick. At one point, we had something of a Republican leader who felt that we should make an issue of it and make a party issue of it by really doing something that you might term drastic for one of the minority groups for our party. I didn't support that position because I felt to do that was trying to buy loyalty. And if you're able to do it, you know the man is for sale, and so he has

a price. And I refused to go along with that philosophy about trying to give more whether it was right or not.

I feel that I have the same compassion for disadvantaged people that any other man has, but I also feel to give without knowing that it's going to really help, why, you might say, "Give." Without having done something for the country in return, why, I'm not sure that this is a kindness to the disadvantaged person. I would disagree completely if there were two people who were equally qualified and then not give someone from a minority group a chance to prove himself. But I think that everyone should have qualifications for jobs. You cannot arbitrarily give to a person just because he happens to be of some race other than white.

At the '61 session, well, there was some marching through the capitol. And if I were to advise people, I would attempt to discourage (that), because I do not feel that it impressed too many legislators, and I think it was resented by some. I believe I felt [more] sorry for those who were picketing. I know that in certain cases, why, they lost support of people who were as fair-minded as they could be but were somewhat disgusted with the show that was put on. There's probably a need for it, but I completely approve of training and giving of opportunity. I do not support the giving of more because I think after several generations, why, they become so in the habit of getting something without trying to better their condition that it is of little help in the long pull for them.

What happened to the legislation, I believe there's some legislation was passed. It wasn't satisfactory to the people, and perhaps it will never be enough. I do not have the answer to it. I have some feelings about it and wished it could be otherwise.

I believe that the gaming legislation, also the commission on equal rights and so forth,

was the cause for the longest session [1961] because we began to find that it looked as if making capital construction available might well be a thing of the past. Of course, in '61, we did appropriate considerable money for capital construction. But I suppose we might say we found out that too many people began to know how much money was available and began to find other uses for it [laughing].

Of course, we have the subject of relationships with the executive and administrative agencies. I think with the administrative agencies, I felt that we never had very much trouble with that; I think our relations were very good. And in '61, our relations certainly improved with Governor Sawyer. I found that he was delightful to be with socially.

LOBBYISTS

[How did it feel to be on the other side of the rail, then, when I was a lobbyist for the Cattle Association?] I felt quite at home. When I was asked to represent them, I said, "Well—" I had known the young man who was the president of the Nevada Cattle Association who asked if I would do this, and I thought a moment, and I said, "Well, I think your asking me is—I just feel that I can't turn you down. However, I think you must understand that if I do not believe that you're right, why, I won't be able to do anything for that particular bit of legislation." I knew they didn't have any money for a paid lobbyist. And I didn't want to be a paid lobbyist because I personally felt that I would lose my effectiveness. And I believe I've mentioned before that I was associated very closely with Mr. Knisley in this. And we went beyond the interests of the cattlemen. But we both decided that to accept pay would remove our effectiveness a great deal.

We worked on some of the tax bills [which] some of the cattlemen had an indirect interest in. We worked on several conservation bills. One of them [was] establishing the Central Nevada Resource Agency, and it came in as what we decided was a very bad piece of legislation. We told them that in the form, the way it was presented, we would oppose it. Their legislation was introduced in another form and we supported it, and helped pass it. And the fact is that that legislation, as written, was one of the most—would have given them more power than any agency should have. We pointed this out, and they agreed that it should be different. The bill would have necessitated eventually an appropriation from the state. We did not feel it was justified and removed that. The sponsors of it, apparently, were very happy after it was worked over. But they knew very well that if Mr. Knisley and I opposed it, it probably wouldn't pass. I think we were helpful. And there were other areas. I didn't think that I could take sixty days of it because I'd become impatient, I'm quite sure [laughing].

[Do ex-legislators make the best lobbyists?] Oh, I don't know whether we were the best lobbyists. I think this certainly would depend. I think just being an ex-legislator might not help at all. Well, I think much depends on the record. I can see some of the legislators, if they attempted to come in and lobby, could very well be the "kiss of death."

I think a successful lobbyist really must be constructive in his attitude. And I care not whether they're representing labor or industry. If they're simply against something, or simply for something, I'm afraid their record wouldn't be good. If they can't make a contribution, why, they would not be successful lobbyists. I feel that way *very*

strongly, that they *must* make a contribution of some kind.

[I've seen a lot of these lobbyists come and go. Do I feel that the paid ones, too, make this kind of contribution that I'm talking about?] Oh, yes. I found most of those people [useful]. Lou Paley has also made a contribution. He has a certain job to do. Of course, being directly elected and drawing a salary, why, it becomes a bit more essential for him to be able to go back and tell his people what he has accomplished. Some of the [others], of course, I think the same is perhaps true, but in just a slightly different way. If you had legislation—oh, at one time, the railroad employees, they came in with something that was known as the bill, the "surrey with the fringe on top," and so forth. It was demanding legislation that the handcars that were used by section workers should have tops on them. I didn't approve of it completely because I felt this should be negotiated in their contract of employment, rather than have to come to the legislature for legislation. There were just a number of bills like that came in.

Certainly, when legislation was introduced to make industrial-connected illness compensable under the Industrial Insurance Act, labor had no argument with me because I felt that a man was injured just as much, or perhaps more, with silicosis, or even in [the] case of working with cattle, such as contracting anthrax. Why, I felt he was injured fully as much as if he'd had a broken leg or a broken back and was entitled to compensation under that. There were some bills, as I say, that I felt should have been the subject for negotiation that I did not go along with.

[What about the man who lobbied from inside the legislature? There are a number who obviously represent special interests,

such as Sailor Ryan. What do I think their effectiveness is as lobbyists and legislators?] Well, Sailor Ryan was in a—some people felt he was utterly ruthless. I did object to some of his tactics. But I think, generally, people had courage enough—if they disagreed with him—that he wouldn't pass his legislation. I must say for Sailor Ryan that he never broke a commitment. Certainly he did not support some of the legislation, and I can well understand how a man who represented labor—for instance, on the sales tax—couldn't help but have his official vote recorded as being against it. Because it has often been said that it was regressive taxation. Well, of course, those same people were all the beneficiaries of education, and there just wasn't anywhere else to go. But we told certain people who felt—and people who were making a contribution, “Just so that we have enough votes for the tax to pass it, we want to see you back here. And if you feel the difference of your voting against this or voting for it would be critical, why, vote against it.” And this happened. But I felt, [although] I was completely on the other side of the fence at times from labor, my relations with Sailor Ryan were all right, and Van Englestead, who was representing CIO. And in fact, I believe it was a member of the Railroad Brotherhood came to me one evening, and after the close of the session, talked about it, and he said, “Well, if you ran for a higher state office, if you think that labor's all going to be against you, you're mistaken, because we have a job to do, so we have to take a position. But I'm going to tell you they know you're not all bad” [laughing].

Some others represented really special interests within the legislature. Mr. [C. C.] Boak obviously represented mining and fish and game. He wasn't there for very many years. Mr. Budelman, in a sense, represented mining, too. I believe that Senator Budelman

was a *better* representative who was also a senator. He did not want mining to be a stepchild. And, of course, [he] did introduce some legislation for exploration on the part of the Bureau of Mines, with the state appropriation. But he did not have a single-track mind.

And I think the people who do have single-track minds who are members of the legislature lose their effectiveness rather rapidly. At least, this was *my* experience with them. You could always talk to them. And certainly, by the same token, why, I felt that I could always be talked to by opponents. Members of the legislature were just a good cross section. You would find, just as you do in all walks of life, a few who are less effective, perhaps less altruistic than others. I just felt that the vast majority took their job seriously and were trying to do a good job. And I enjoyed working with them.

I think you have to accept that people such as Sailor Ryan has a job to do. And he never tried to deceive anyone. And Sailor Ryan introduced some good legislation. And he lost some that I questioned that he expected to see passed.

A SUMMARY OF MY LEGISLATIVE CAREER

I have been asked to comment, or to give a summary of events during my time in the legislature. Certainly they were rewarding years. I found that making the decision to close my legislative career was the second most difficult thing of my life to this time, the first, of course, being the disposing of the ranch on which I was born.

At various times, I was accused, or perhaps credited, with having substantial power. Personally, I never felt that way. I certainly found that working in the legislature was a give-and-take experience. I just never

felt that any position that I took couldn't be discussed with other people. I also have many close friends. At all times, I've felt that I enjoyed being in the legislature, and hoped that I might have the friendship and respect of everyone. But if it ever became necessary to settle for one or the other, it seemed just elemental to me that I would rather have respect than friendship. Accomplishments were not made entirely with personal effort. It was always with the assistance of other people. I do not believe that I ever sponsored any self-serving legislation. And I do believe that a legislator in that position can be more effective than if he has acted otherwise.

I sometimes wonder why there are people who feel that I have power. I never felt that I did. If I did, I rather hope that I exercised it judiciously. I think I was motivated almost entirely by what I felt, and at times I might have been wrong, about what I honestly believed was good for the state of Nevada. I feel that I have little to add except that I enjoyed the help and cooperation of many people, regardless of party affiliation.

The financial picture as I saw it evolve, I believe it was a team effort. The financial procedures that were developed there during the time that Ken Johnson was the chairman of finance, he felt there were spots that would be rejected if he was the out-and-out sponsor for it. And I think that it was—is—true on the other side. There were spots where one of the other senators could do a better job than I could. I remember at one time, the assembly had cut a substantial portion of the University's budget. Senator Johnson said to me, he says, "You know, I can't handle the chairman of ways and means. I think you'd better try it." I did, and I was successful in making the restoration.

We worked together closely, and I think by so doing, why, if accomplishments were

made, we did it as a group. And I'm flattered by having people say that I had power, but if I did, I never was sure that I used it [laughing].

In a few areas I was accused of being too modest and let others get the credit. And I was totally indifferent to that, because all I was interested in was doing the job. And I believe in the—certainly, the rewards were many, and the letters that I received upon retirement were, I think, certainly wholly unexpected and surprising to me—one of them from an Indian, which was really one of my most precious letters.

[Why did I decide not to run again?] Well, I definitely felt that there was a time. I certainly did not retire from fear because I had been on the ballot often enough that if I couldn't accept defeat, I knew I didn't have any business being in politics. I feel that I could've accepted defeat just very graciously, with no hard feelings toward the individual that might have filed against me. I had opposition, of course, even when I was running for the school board, and had opposition, I think, twice, running for the senate. We certainly visited and were ready to buy each other a drink or what have you the day after election. It was never my position that someone else didn't have a right to file.

I felt that I had seen a few people who stayed too long because they were no longer effective by reasons of health, and also by reason of mental, you might say, agility. I promised myself that I wasn't going to do this. I also felt that anyone staying too long loses touch with problems. I can see very valid reasons for people in industry having mandatory retirements. I also felt that I had a man who I was sure would at least file for the office, who I had tried to bring along in his legislative work, and he was entitled to move. And I had reached the age when I could fail,

begin to fail. And some of these people that I had watched didn't realize they were failing. So I just simply made up my mind that I was going to move out and make room, because I did not feel that I was indispensable, and make room for someone else while I still felt that my faculties were intact [laughing].

Of course, Rex Bell, when he filed for governor, really wanted me to be on the ticket with him as lieutenant governor. And I felt, well, if I'd wanted to stay in public life, I'd prefer to be the chairman of finance rather than to be lieutenant governor because I would not have been comfortable to've just been the presiding officer and not have a vote or my hand in. What I enjoyed was state finances, and so I had to say no to Rex Bell.

DEALING WITH WATER AND ASSOCIATED ISSUES

LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE CARSON RIVER WATER SYSTEM

Today has been more or less set aside to discuss water issues and problems in the Carson Valley. [Consulting papers] I believe I would like to begin with what was the first major litigation, in which the Union Mill and Mining Company were the complainants, or the plaintiffs, and the upstream water users, who were the defendants. In going over the names of the defendants in that case, it has been interesting to me that no California resident was named as a defendant, although they were diverting water from both forks of the Carson River. As far as I have been able to learn, this was the first suit in which the doctrine of priority was used. In other words, the defendants, who have a right prior to 1860, had an unrestricted right as far as the plaintiffs in the action were concerned. The water

that the Union Mill and Mining Company asserted belonged to them was used to drive the mills on the Carson River where the ore

from the Comstock was milled. It was a long fought case, filed sometime prior to 1890. The decree was handed down by Judge [Thomas P.] Hawley on September 20, 1897,

An interesting statement showed up in some of the evidence that I read in the *Pacific Reporter*, wherein the mining company agreed that when the stream dropped to a certain flow, it was useless to attempt to bring the water to the mills. They gained a right to use 6,000 inches, which today would be stated as 150 second feet, with which to operate the mills. They attempted to come to the upper reaches of the river and shut down ditches, and found that the river lost a great deal of water in conveyance. When they didn't have sufficient water, of course, it didn't do them any good. The ranchers in the upper Carson were permitted to divert the entire flow during the months of June, July, and August.

Certainly, many rights after 1860 under this decree were prohibited from using any water. If there was sufficient water available to drive the mills, these ranchers were cut off. This, of course, was a theoretical fact—or, I

should say, was a theoretical conclusion. I seriously doubt that it ever was a fact. I think they found it very difficult to police at all times.

It is a very interesting case to research. However, the conclusions of that case are completely moot at this time. I don't know just how they milled their ore. Perhaps after electricity came in, they had mills right on the Comstock. Of course, production by 1900 or shortly thereafter was almost nil. The record shows that the Union Mill and Mining Company was completely dissolved in the year of 1906.

There, of course, were many small or civil suits on various small streams, commonly referred to as the mountain streams, where two neighbors or more were using water out of [the] same stream. And those cases were all filed in the local state courts.

But then the next major lawsuit was filed by water users in Nevada on the west fork of the Carson against water users within the state of California. The decree entered in that case was No. 12857, Ninth Circuit Court, District of California. Of course, water rights had not been established; priorities had not been established. And during the later part of the season, the water users on the upper reaches of the river would dry up the stream completely. They needed a cutoff place, I suppose, so the Nevada users decided to sue everyone above the state line. They probably could've sued some of the upper users just below the California state line, also, but this is the way it was done.

I remember when I was rather a small boy, that in order to get stock water and water for the garden and just a little water in the stream to freshen it, why, usually about sundown or shortly thereafter, some of the water users in Nevada would decide to go into California arid break dams and

hopefully get eight or twelve hours of water. My dad accompanied them a number of times in my recollection. But, of course, this settled no problem. So the suit was brought, and again there was quite a little hard feeling by people who in normal times were very close friends. And this continued for a short time, I would say a few years, after the decree was filed.

Well, on paper, it appeared that California users got just a little the best of it. However, the Nevada people were satisfied if they would just get a little water on a sure basis for a certain length of time. It actually eventually wound up to be a consent decree arranged by water users on both sides. The gist of it was that after a certain day, which was designated in the suit as the first Monday in June, water users in Nevada were permitted to take all of the water that was in the west fork; and thereafter, on alternate weeks, California users were entitled to the use of the entire river. As a matter of fact, there is something over 3,000 acres in California that were being irrigated, and near 10,100 acres on the west fork in Nevada.

It must be said that the lands in California require more water than some of the land in Nevada. however, this decree was entered as No. 12857. This decree applies only to water users on the west fork of the Carson River in California and Nevada. No master was ever appointed to enforce the provisions of the decree. The decree did impose certain limitations as to quantities of water on some of the defendants' lands. These lands were known as the non-riparian lands. It was realized by both the plaintiffs and the defendants that the literal imposition of the quantitative allocation would not only injure individuals, but would also cause an unnecessary waste of water by reason of the user not having a head of water that was sufficient to efficiently irrigate his land.

Essentially, the only portion of the above decree that is used today is a provision for rotation after a certain date. Today it is completely accepted, and it is my firm conviction that the principles of that decree should go into any future [settlement], or specifically, the *U. S. vs. Alpine*, which is, of course, a case that was filed in 1926 against all upper users. By that, I mean the water users above Lahontan reservoir in both California and Nevada. That will be the next piece of litigation that we will discuss.

This suit was filed in 1926, and actually, many of us felt that it was what might be termed a suit to quiet title. A great deal of evidence was taken, objections were filed, briefs were filed, and then for one reason or another, it was never completely submitted to the court. I have felt that much of the delay can well be laid at the doors of the Department of Justice of the United States. I was a party to many conferences attempting to work out a settlement. It appears that it was necessary to have a number of funerals [laughing] to get people into the frame of mind that this should be discussed by farmers and water users in both areas, rather than to leave it entirely to the attorneys.

I made a number of trips to the Fallon area with people who were very much my senior. We didn't seem to get anywhere. And then about 1950, I was called into George DeVore's office; he was at that time the engineer in charge of water for the Sierra Pacific Power Company on the Truckee River, and had been deeply involved in all the Truckee River litigation. He asked if I could get a group of water users in the upper Carson to attend the conference. And he and I talked to some understanding people from the Fallon area, and we were moving along very nicely. We reached agreement with attorneys for both the plaintiffs and defendants.

Mr. William J. Cashill of Reno at that time was the deputy U. S. Attorney in charge of federal water matters for this state, but it seemed impossible to get people in Washington to move. But Mr. Cashill passed away, and that was a severe loss, in my opinion, to all concerned.

It remained a dead issue for quite some time, and this was particularly true during the time that the Bureau of Reclamation was investigating the Washoe Project. Of course, before the Washoe Project was constructed, why, it seemed apparent, especially to me, that the *U. S. vs. Alpine* suit must be settled. There were others who felt—or who held a different opinion.

But during the 1960's, Washington again became interested in reaching agreement. I accompanied several attorneys to Washington at least two times. At that time, we found that the agencies of the federal government were having more differences among themselves about this suit than we had with the government. It's strange to me why this should be. I cannot help but make the statement that any litigation that must lie inactive the way this has must be proof that no one—or particularly the plaintiffs in the action—were suffering any damage. If there had been, certainly it would have been prosecuted to gain what was their just due.

I had hoped that I could see that litigation settled during my lifetime. I felt if that could have been settled the way that the farmers in Fallon and on the upper Carson had agreed, it would've been—well, I don't know hardly what else to say, except my crowning achievement. I would've [laughing] been willing to say that my work was finished. Today, I have no reason to think that it will be settled in the foreseeable future.

I believe that I can say this? [the Department of] Justice tells us that if it

were not for the Pyramid situation and a few people who have civil service status in the Department of Interior, why, we could settle it.

Of course, within recent years, why, the Pyramid tribe has attempted to intervene in the Carson River suit under the guidance of Mr. Robert Leland. Judge [Roger] Foley, in the Nevada district court, rejected his petition to intervene. The defendants, of course, filed an answer with the appellate court in San Francisco that *that* petition be rejected. The appellate court at this time has not come out with any position. I am sure that if the appellate court permitted the Pyramid Lake tribe to intervene, it would be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States by the defendants. Of course, the Supreme Court might refuse to hear it, which is within their province. I do not know what the position of the tribe would be if the appellate court rejected the petition to intervene. If it were rejected and not appealed, it could well be that we could move toward settlement.

Of course, my own position is that not a drop of Carson River water has ever gone to Pyramid. Certainly, Carson River water users could in no way injure the tribe. I have told a solicitor for the Department of Interior that if they were able to intervene and cut the use of water on the Carson River just to a bare bones allotment, why, they would not gain 10,000 acre feet for Lahontan that they do not now receive. I further stated that, in my opinion, one good windstorm on Pyramid would evaporate that much water or more. There's no logic in their attempting to move in on the Carson.

In discussing the position of the tribe at Pyramid Lake, I certainly would not wish to convey the impression that I am anti-Indian any more than I am "anti" anyone else. I have

had lifelong friends among the Indians; in fact, they were among my earliest playmates when I was a child. I do have a high regard for them, and in this case, it might be said that their interests were damaged. However, it was not people on the Carson River, or not people on the Truckee River. If you believe that they have been damaged, I believe you should recognize the fact that it was an agency of the federal government that is responsible. And if this is the decision, they should be compensated by the federal government rather than attempt to have people in the local area pick up or take care of the dereliction of the federal government.

IRRIGATION IN THE CARSON VALLEY

At this point, it would perhaps be not amiss to discuss the history of irrigation in this valley, which, of course, I have talked about some at a previous time.

Of course, the earliest water rights in this Valley are 1852, and gradual increase in clearing land came about. But I suppose there are near three or four thousand acres that were irrigated and have rights during the 1850's and the early '60's. If you would include all of the 1860's, you would run into an acreage well in excess of ten thousand acres. Today, on the Carson River area above Lahontan, there's slightly in excess of 40,000 acres being irrigated.

The property in this area is still, in large part, in the hands of people who've been here for—well, some second and third and fourth generation. In fact, there's a few properties that are—the fifth generation is growing up on the same property. Many of those people have land that would be susceptible of being irrigated. But these people understand that shortages of water exist. And it would serve no good purpose to put in additional acres

when you realize that the area does have a water shortage.

Not each year. I think it would be well to bring out that the Bureau of Reclamation has figured—made the statement—that on the average, the upper Carson River had a shortage running from twenty to forty percent. Of course, averages in water are rather meaningless to me because it's a feast or a famine. One exceedingly big year brings up the average, and you might have just two or three normal years during a ten- or fifteen-year period. I believe that the agricultural people have used their water wisely, and their decision not to expand their acreage was certainly in the field of good management.

The more I thought of my going into any story on the Alpine Land and Reservoir Company, the more I felt it would be just a bit presumptuous on my part because I didn't know enough. And I did not have the time to research it. I found that [referring to papers] Reinhold Sadler was a member of the group that filed on all of those potential reservoir sites on the upper Carson. And this group was composed [most importantly] of William Thornburg and H. F. Musser of Alpine County, California. I'm sure those two men were the people who knew the mountains, where the various lakes and basins were.

The Nevada residents that were involved in this was George I. Lamy, George W. Keith, Elizabeth E. Jones (who happened to be a widow of a man who was involved with the men prior to his death), Reinhold Sadler, and Adolph Livingston. That group formed what was known as the Alpine Land and Reservoir Company. They filed on all of these potential reservoir sites in 1895. The filings were all made in the courthouse of the county in which the lakes were located. All of the lakes were in Alpine County. This is

all that the law required. There was no state division of water rights. It was entirely on the county level.

In 1896, a group of Carson Valley ranchers purchased the rights that had been filed on by the aforementioned people. I believe that transfer was made in June of 1896. The first directors of, you might term—I believe it had another name—but they again changed the name to the Alpine Land and Reservoir Company. I believe they called it a water and land development company originally. But the first local directors were C. M. Henningsen, Fritz Heise, H. F. Dangberg, Jr. (he was a son of the original H. F. Dangberg, who was a major landowner in the valley), John Franzten, and I believe H. H. Springmeyer was a member of that group. I'm just going to have to plead ignorance of what their activities consisted of, other than when the Dresslers and we—perhaps I should say the Settelmeyers—decided to build reservoirs on the west fork of the Carson on which the Alpine Land and Reservoir Company had approved filings which we purchased from them.

In these cases, why, we owned the land, but they had the recognized water rights which had been accepted by the federal government. The federal government had denied some of the filings. But the lakes that we were interested in were Red Lake, Scott Lake, and Crater Lake. I have not been able to find the document. They were, of course, of federal origin, but Mr. [Carsten] Henningsen assured me that their filings had been accepted by—I don't know whether it was the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of Justice. An investigation had taken place. And so we acquired those rights which we used to defend our claims in the *U. S. vs. Alpine*.

Now I was told that all of the early records of the Alpine —minutes and organization,

bylaws, and so forth—are on file with the secretary of state. So I'm sure that your department would have access to those. And when I found out that fact, why, I felt I was going to forego the research. And certainly, I did not have time. And as far as I know, they still are a corporation. And, of course, this is the reason for them being on file in the secretary of state's office.

[In the Carson Valley, there has been opposition to the Newlands Project, and personal animosity to Senator Newlands because of this project. Can I explain that?] The feeling was engendered, I think, largely, of course, by the water litigation that was filed in 1926. Prior to that time, why, the people didn't—their paths did not cross often. And, of course, many years ago, people in this area were hopeful of a reclamation project, a federal project. Senator Newlands or his family owned quite a lot of land in this valley at one time. He also acquired, or *they* acquired a larger acreage in the lower end of the Carson. Of course, I could be wrong, but I have many times felt that Senator Newlands's reason for introducing this reclamation act was not entirely altruistic because it was the one way that some of his land might be sold.

I'm not sure, but I believe that the Occidental Land Company, which was the Newlands family holding company, owned more ground there than they did in this [Carson] valley. This valley, of course, at all times turned the federal project down largely on account of the 160-acre limitation. I don't feel that people were more aggressive here in Carson Valley than other places, but it was just a business proposition. They found that a small area, or small ranch, did not do for them and their families what they wished to be done. They found it could be done, it was easier to do it, and more efficient to do it, on larger units. And so they consistently turned

down reclamation projects due to the 160-acre limitation.

There was this. There were some, oh, you might call them "personal animosities." I was involved in that when I was quite young. But I never found that they refused to drink each other's whiskey [laughing].

THE CALIFORNIA-NEVADA INTERSTATE COMPACT COMMISSION

We're about to discuss the California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission. I know of nothing that has been more misrepresented and created more misunderstanding than this particular bit of legislation. This was brought about by discussion of people connected with the water problems in both California and Nevada. Responsible people felt there was a potential for very long and extensive litigation between the people living near the border of California and Nevada. It was suggested that the best manner of handling this, or solving it, was through compact legislation.

I, along with the other Nevada senators who represented counties in western Nevada adjoining California, introduced the legislation in the Nevada legislature. This was in 1955, and the act became effective on July 1, 1956. Commissions were set up in both states. It was also consented to by the Congress of the United States, which was necessary; and negotiations began.

It was difficult for people who were appointed to the Commission in the first few years to understand the charge that had been given them, that charge being in large measure to allocate waters between the state of California and the state of Nevada on the Walker, the Carson, and the Truckee Rivers, and Lake Tahoe. There have been several compacts negotiated in various other states,

but none of them, in my opinion, with the complexities of this particular one. None of them involved more than one river.

Of course, compacts usually are instruments that cross state lines. Negotiations were at times difficult. They were able men representing both states, and they were hard-headed. There are times when it reminded you of a boxing match with the sparring that went on. They gradually developed the feeling that no compact would be successful unless you recognized existing issues.

Of course, water rights in all cases have not been adjudicated. If there were uses, such as domestic uses along a stream, or perhaps close to a spring where someone had established a summer residence in California (and there were a number of these), why, they were accepted as a use and so recognized. We attempted to recognize existing decrees such as Decree No. 183 on the Walker, and the *U. S. vs. Orr* on the Truckee, and while we do not have the decree on the Carson, we recognize the uses as being substantially that as stated in the Mueller findings.*

The Mueller findings followed rather closely the preliminary findings made by the state engineer who had hoped to enter a decree on Nevada users on the Carson River, but, of course, was precluded from doing this by the filing of the *U. S. VS. Alpine*, and whereupon the state engineer of Nevada lost control of the Carson River. The compact was not charged, nor did it have the authority to grant rights, be it to an individual or an association of individuals.

Much has been said about the injustice that the compact does to the Pyramid tribe. In my opinion, even though the Commission had *desired* to allocate water to Pyramid Lake, under the legislation and the various acts that authorized the compact, the Commission would be acting beyond its

authority to allocate water. They felt they did recognize the right that had been granted to the Indians under the *U. S. vs. Orr* decree, and recognized the priority to the complete amount of water that they have, even though they did not have or could not show that they had used the amount of water that the decree allotted to them—this, in spite of the fact that under Nevada law, no one gains a right by application for a right unless that water is used beneficially.

Ultimately, why, of course, the compact was arrived at. It was ratified by the members of the joint commission at a meeting on July 25, 1968. I believe it is worthy of approval by the state of California. Of course, the state of Nevada legislature approved it by an overwhelming vote, and it should also be approved by Congress.

In absence of this eventual approval, I see extremely expensive and lengthy litigation. Lake Tahoe, without the compact, has no authority to export sewage, which is being done. The compact gave authority for the export of sewage. There are questionable uses of water at Tahoe without the compact. The compact set aside 34,000 acre feet of water to the Tahoe Basin, with roughly 23,000 to the state of California, and 11,000 acre feet to Nevada. This could well be termed a concession of sorts by lower Truckee River water users because title to all the storage in Lake Tahoe rests in the name of the United States, for the benefit of the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District and possibly for other federal uses. I am referring to the six feet of storage permitted, or agreed to. Legally, the federal government might insist, or even perhaps two feet higher. There's some

*Mr. John V. Mueller was the federal master who heard the arguments.

disagreement on that. But then by agreement to avoid damage of high water, why, the so-called Truckee River agreement set the figure, the six feet of storage limit, which, of course, amounts to 720,000 acre feet for that area. The federal government acquired this right by condemnation proceedings against the Truckee River General Electric Company, the predecessor of Sierra Pacific Power Company. California interests were not parties to the *U.S. vs. Orr Ditch* decree. Nevada water users were.

But there are many diversions within Nevada that have made sense, and certainly the Compact Commission did not feel that they could go to people at Tahoe and say, "We're cutting your pipeline. The water will no longer come out of your taps. This is an illegal diversion." So we attempted to recognize uses. There was general agreement among these people, and they were many competent engineers with a good background in hydrology who felt the development should stop at Tahoe and never have made use of the 34,000 [acre feet]. In certain areas, it might be said that this was concession on the part of California because California, of course, has water rights known as littoral. Ground bordering a lake, just because it was adjacent to the lake, had certain water rights, and also riparian which is rather a complicated right, but they do exist at Tahoe. there certainly was no attempt to injure anyone, and it was beyond the province of this Commission to permit initiation of new rights and new uses to the detriment of those presently being beneficially used.

I believe it would be well that everyone understands that at the many joint commission meetings, as well as the various subcommittee meetings on the rivers involved, there were present at all times representative of the federal government, the chairman of the

joint commission who represented the Department of the Interior. Also present were representatives of the Indian Service, representatives of the California and Nevada Fish and Game Commission. And at most of the meetings, there was a representative, one or more, of the tribal council at Pyramid. No one can deny that they did have the opportunity to be informed of all the problems and negotiations involved. Unless one followed it closely, you could not help but be confused, but the opportunity was there at all times to be informed.

Quite a few of these meetings were not entirely pleasant because certainly each state had individuals that were well informed and felt that this was a game that was being played for keeps. I remember a few instances, particularly one case, where a commissioner representing Nevada took offense when a representative of California felt that they were going to, you might say, rewrite, or break, a federal court decree. Nevada's representative at that point just threw his pencil on the table, closed his book, said, "Well, if you're—if that position is irrevocable, I'm leaving as of now." However, the California representative did not have the support of his commission in his request, and they went on and kept working until they resolved the Walker River situation.

I am sure that the solution is infinitely better than had the Commission broken up and litigation had resulted. Everyone there knows what their potential is. I feel the same situation arose on all rivers. I think that, generally, the decision on Tahoe was acceptable with less discussion than any of the rivers.

At one point, California felt they were not being given the proper consideration. In fact, they were attempting to claim more water than the decree which covers the diversion from the Truckee to Sierra Valley, which use

was initiated many years ago, then finally was taken to court, and again, a consent decree was arrived at. But we did have some pressure to permit California to increase that diversion. Well, this certainly would have been just as wrong as could be for Nevada interests. There were people on the Truckee representing the Truckee River who insisted that a court action would be far to be preferred to permitting this to happen. Then after lengthy discussions, why, California agreed not to press this.

But there are many times it appeared that the Commission was going to break up. And then suddenly, it appeared that everyone felt that they realized after all the studies that were involved, that all of the eastern slope of the Sierras was in a water-deficient area. No one could have all that they desired. The supply just was not there. And this is, I think, a surprising thing, how things fall into their proper place. People seemed to realize that it was a give-and-take, and they were negotiating in good faith, and the area of suspicion seemed to disappear.

Of course, there were many changes, some by death, a number by resignation, and a number due to change in positions. But this removed some of the personality clashes that were involved. And I would say perhaps some of those things were necessary, and with no discredit to any individual.

[When it came time to negotiate on the Carson River, what did I take with me to these negotiations? With all of my knowledge of the river and its allocations and so forth, did I have a written study, or just my own knowledge of the river?] At one point, California people came in with rather a long statement of how the Carson River should be settled. They expected to receive—or they requested that a flat acre-foot allocation be made to the area in California. My recollection is this was in the neighborhood of

44,000 acre feet. Their position was that they would be satisfied with this, but they wanted the first priority. In other words, the first 44,000 acre feet that came down the river during the irrigation season would belong to California. Well, this, of course, would be a very simple way to do it. Certainly, at that point, I was representing the upper Carson. And this is one of the days that I felt that I didn't mind if we blew the compact. Fortunately, I took the position that the only year that this would be at all fair to Nevada is that when you have a very high water year. And fortunately, I had the support of the California representative representing the upper Carson River.

For another involvement on the Carson River, I had gotten all of the daily flow sheets from the USGS. I was familiar with the short years and the dry years, not only from the study made of these flow sheets, but also, of course, by being a ranch operator on the stream. We had years such as 1924, when the west Carson River only flowed 28,000 acre feet for the entire year. California interests did recognize the Anderson-Bassman* decree where that rotation would come in just as it does now. But other than that, certainly in that year, the Nevada interests suffered terrifically.

I want to repeat—when this was broached, it was possibly the day that I was more disturbed than almost any day. But I did have the support of the California representative. I insisted that we were all on the same river, and historically, we had shared the heavy water flows, and I thought we should also share the water in years of low yield. And you might say we threw out this document that was filed. It was interesting, and if you had the same amount of water and had an excess—

**John Anderson vs. Henry Bassman, et al.*

or, we'll say, an ample—supply of water, this suggestion would have been just simple and easy to operate. It appeared that there were members of the Commission who would buy it, but they did not have the intimate knowledge of the stream system.

We later developed a formula which I suppose it must be said that I worked it out more or less on a flow allocation, hoping that we might be able to incorporate the same matter in the *U. S. vs. Alpine* suit. Well, we were able to convince the Commission that this was reasonable and also logical. But it took months and months to work this out. In fact, at one point, I was about ready to resign as a consultant because I was having difficulty with—we had our problems within our own commissions, also. And it had reached the point where I felt that I wasn't of any use. I did file a letter of resignation which the state engineer refused to accept. And looking back, why, I think it was well that he did not. Those are examples. Meetings of the Compact Commission certainly were not Sunday school picnics [laughing].

[How was this 44,000 acre-foot proposal first made?] Well, that first proposal came about by the state engineer of Nevada, who was then Mr. [Edmund] Muth, and a representative of the Division of Water Resources in California, who had worked out this schedule. I've often called it the "California plan," but I was informed by Mr. Muth that this was not that, that Nevada was involved in this. Without wishing to discredit Mr. Muth at all, it was worked out on paper, and it looked like the theory was fine. But the plan was submitted, and they felt this was going to be the answer. It was kicked around, and I believe, at this same meeting or the following meeting, I submitted what I felt was nothing more or nothing less than the method that had been used for more than

fifty years. And the California representatives dropped the plan that had been submitted by the representatives of the state agencies.

[Did Mr. Muth not consult with me before he drew this plan?] He did not. Not prior to the time that they designed it and presented it. [Do I know what advice he had in proposing such a figure?] No. Of course, he had far more experience in the technical handling of water than I did, and I suppose he felt he was self-sufficient. It did come to me as a complete surprise.

Of course, the studies that were made, all these studies were made on certain assumptions, I suppose, made on assumptions of strict enforcement of decrees and strict conformance with decrees. And there's volumes of them. But, of course, eventually, it seems to me that the commission considered all of the studies. But finally, the ultimate conclusions were made with intimate knowledge of how this water had been handled, and with the realization, which seemed difficult to sell, that we were in a deficient water area. And so you had to have a give-and-take attitude.

THE PYRAMID LAKE TASK FORCE AND ASSOCIATED PROBLEMS

Our subject of discussion today is the Pyramid Lake Task Force. This came about as a result of the meeting between Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel, Governor Ronald Reagan, and Governor Paul A. Laxalt. Of course, they covered the area in one day, which is hardly enough time to understand the problem completely. They did decide that the governor of California would appoint two people more as consultants, or observers, due to the fact that, of course, there were California interests involved. There was rather an extensive group of federal agency people

representing the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The governor of Nevada appointed people from the various river areas. The Walker River, of course, was not involved in this, and there was no representative of the Walker River appointed. There were people on the Truckee and representatives of Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, and a representative of the tribal council at Pyramid Lake. I was appointed by Governor Laxalt to represent the interests of the upper Carson River.

The problem that has been placed before this committee is a very involved problem, I would say largely due to the fact that we are in a very water-deficient area. In addition to that, the water rights have been established under state law; federal rights were gained in compliance with state law. And a long and extensive amount of litigation occurred on the Truckee River, which gave certain rights to upstream users on the Truckee, the downstream users on the Truckee, of course, being principally the diversion from the Truckee to the Carson River basin through the Derby canal, which carried water from the Truckee to Lahontan for use on the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District. To the best of my knowledge, that suit was dropped by the government on behalf of the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District and the Indian tribe at Pyramid Lake. This apparently was considered to be a settled condition until recently, when the demand arose for more water for Pyramid.

For me, it is rather difficult to separate the work of the Task Force from that of the compact. However, the federal officials advised us that we were not to consider the compact discussions in this assignment of trying to get more water for Pyramid.

I suppose the reason that I was appointed was due to a motion that was filed by Mr. Robert

Leland on behalf of the Indians to intervene in the Carson River. My contention is— and this has been the contention of, I would say all, or at least well over ninety percent of the actual water users on the Carson River—that no water, no Carson River water had at any time in history been delivered water to Pyramid Lake. Certainly no Carson River water ever reached Pyramid after the disappearance of the prehistoric Lake Lahontan. I am of the opinion that the rather rapid drop in Pyramid Lake was due in large measure to the rather serious drought that occurred in western Nevada, which I experienced during the years approximately from 1924 to 1934. I do not deny that the building of the Derby canal and the construction of Lahontan Dam may have accelerated it slightly. But the lake would have dropped during that time if the Derby canal had never been constructed. And certainly, there were other years. I believe there are some statistics available either in the study made by Dr. Church and Dr. Boardman of the University of Nevada, or someone else connected with the University. Historically, I'm sure there was a drought in Pyramid during the early 1860's. I remember an elderly neighbor of ours telling my father that in the year 1861 he had to use a scraper to scrape holes in the riverbed so that his cattle had water to drink.

In 1862, they had one of the heaviest floods, which Dr. Church spoke of in his story of the floods of Nevada during the time of the white settlement. In 1862, there was a flood which changed the course of the west fork of the Carson completely, making what was known as the Brockliss Slough the major stream. So, during those years, I'm sure that Pyramid took a very rapid drop because at that time, there was no storage on the Truckee, no storage at Tahoe. And so when the flood was past, when the runoff was over with, why,

the heavy increment to Pyramid was over with. Likewise, when you had a dry year, the Truckee would produce very little water. Then going over the flow studies that I developed from USGS records, why, the years from 1900 to 1910 were nearly all above normal. And during those years, Pyramid, of course, would rise. And I suppose that is the time when Winnemucca Lake was just an added lake in the Pyramid basin.

I am at a loss to know how this Task Force can improve the situation to the extent that is desired with the streams and the flows that are presently available, unless we again have a long, wet cycle such as we had from 1900 to 1910. The only possibility of stabilizing Pyramid—well, I should not say stabilizing, because I do not believe that a terminal lake can ever be stabilized. The winter of 1968-69, of course, produced a tremendous amount of water. But the lake hasn't risen [more than] about eight feet. It is again in 1970 receiving a very sizable accretion. It has raised approximately one foot from its low point of 1969 at the present time. So, with normal precipitation from now until May 1, Pyramid will again rise. So we'll have Pyramid—*if* this occurs, we'll have Pyramid rise again.

It must be remembered that the evaporation on Pyramid is very high. For a number of years, why, I was told that the average evaporation on Pyramid was about five feet vertically per year, which would indicate that there was near a half million acre-feet evaporated. Now, federal people, or federal agencies, tell us the average evaporation is about 3.75 feet. Actually, there is no one, other than perhaps God Almighty, who could arrange to keep Pyramid anywhere near a stable elevation, So I think stabilization is completely out of the question.

It is perhaps true that by regulation and by improvements at excessive cost, in my

opinion, by lining all ditches, or as one federal representative suggested, of pipe-lining all of the ditches in the Truckee-Carson Irrigation area, some saving could be made, but not to the extent of the 150,000 acre feet that is desired by the Pyramid interests on an average basis. There isn't anywhere near that much waste in the Truckee-Carson basin that can be reclaimed without serious injury to water users who certainly settled and reclaimed land in the Fallon area, and in complete good faith with the assurance that they would have the water that was necessary. In addition to that, if in the lining of those ditches they did reclaim water and conveyed it without loss, of course, the drains would not supply water to the Stillwater wildlife area for the duck and migratory bird life which is so necessary, *if* you are interested in that sport.

Without taking away from some present users, why, there isn't any possibility of providing the water that has been asked for by the federal people. It has been discussed that water rights might be purchased—in other words, they would move into the various river basins and purchase lands and have them revert to desert for the benefit of Pyramid. I do not believe that this is a practical possibility. Certainly the only place that they could do this would be in the Truckee River basin above Derby, or in the Reno area, or in the Fallon area. With the potential needs for domestic use in the Reno area, It seriously doubt that this is economically feasible. When you move down into the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District area, the removal of water from much of that area destroys the economic situation of the area a great, great deal. The economy of the town of Fallon depends in large measure on the activity in the agricultural area. So I would feel that *if* it was deemed desirable to buy water rights, they would also have to buy, or compensate,

the business interests that depend on the farming interest in the area.

Of course, my particular assignment is the upper Carson. And when we get down to the real nuts and bolts of this discussion, why, I feel I cannot do otherwise than to oppose the suggestion that was made by the former Secretary Udall and the present Secretary Hickel to maximize the use of the Carson River water, which would mean essentially to take water from the Carson River for the use in Lahontan, and thus make more water available to Pyramid from the Truckee. I will have no choice but to oppose that with all the strength that I have.

The Carson River, by the Bureau of Reclamation, which is certainly an agency of the Department of the Interior, shows that on the average, the upper Carson experiences a shortage of from twenty to forty percent. Some of the older rights had a history of twenty percent shortage, some of the newer rights a forty percent shortage each and every year.

And I have far more than an academic background in this. I know that the shortage exists on something besides paper. I know that in one of the drought years that we had well over a hundred acres that we never put a mowing machine on, and on the rest of the area, we cut less than half a crop. There are only a very few years when there is any unused water on the Carson, if we respect and serve the rights of the irrigation district at Fallon. I informed Mr. [Charles] Renda, who's the present solicitor for the Bureau of Reclamation in the Sacramento area, who are also in charge of the Bureau's activities in western Nevada, that in my judgment, without doing serious injury in the upper Carson, to just serve water to its minimum that they were hoping to do, they could not gain more than ten thousand acre feet of

water. I have since discussed this with the man who's in charge of water distribution, and he feels that the figure that I gave was high. This water commissioner felt you would not gain more than six thousand feet. Well, at the time when I discussed this with Mr. Renda, I was sure that one good windstorm at Pyramid would evaporate far more water than they could ever gain.

So, of course, my interest, being only on the Carson, I attend meetings and, you might say, just sit there waiting for them to attack the Carson, at which time I suppose I will be speaking my mind.

The further criticism that I have of this suggested thought of stabilizing, or at least mitigating the fluctuation of Pyramid, is that we find there are private interests who are hopeful that Pyramid will gain this water so that you can have extensive resort development at Pyramid, which, of course, means—because certainly, in Nevada, no resort will be built that does not envision the idea of having a major gambling casino. So we would have an acceleration of that. And as far as I am concerned, this will not make Pyramid Lake more attractive. It took some time to smoke this out, that this was the proposed development. But I finally got this from the chairman of the Tribal Council.

[What's the conclusion on this? What is the Task Force going to have to conclude in my opinion?] Well, certainly, when the Secretary of the Interior and the governors of these two states requested this, why, I think the people who serve on the Task Force should approach it with an open mind because I would not object to doing something to help the Indians and to help Pyramid stay alive as long as possible. But I believe the Task Force is obligated to come up with recommendations. I don't know what they will be. They have even considered going into the Smoke Creek

Desert. They plan on studying that water basin. The U. S. Geological Survey and the Division of Water Resources in Nevada have agreed to make a preliminary study to see what amount of water is available on an annual basis. They feel there is a substantial amount of water underground, but this would mean, I think, some thirty or forty miles of pipeline with innumerable wells, if it happens to be an area that is a desert area, so the annual recharge in that area is not large. You could mine it, and someone said, "Well, perhaps we could mine it and drop that water table much below its natural recharge and help preserve it."

And, of course, then everyone says, "Well, the only way that it can be completely taken care of is bringing water from the northwest."

And informed people say, "Well, you've got to go beyond the boundaries of the United States proper. You have to go into Canada, and you might have to go all the way to the Yukon." So, of course, that will not happen in time to bring out any substantial assistance during the lifetime of people now living.

So there are a few of us that feel that we should just face facts. They got into a short discussion and they were planning some rather expensive studies, which I feel have already been made by both the Compact Commission and the present advisory committee set up by the federal government. The result of those studies will show to me that we're still 150,900 acre feet short. There are those that feel that this is not true. Perhaps I'm so close to the situation that I can't see the trees for the forest. We certainly have not gotten to the point. There are many suggestions which have been made, and we're going to have to begin to delete some of the suggestions and admit that they are not possible. (I think I'd like to say now that I'm hopeful that this recording will not be

released until the Task Force has completed their work.)

What do I think is going to happen in terms of politics when such a report comes out?] The Indians do have support. I cannot see that it's going to have a great effect on the possible political changes or the effect on it. For the present time, certainly, Governor Laxalt is not a candidate. So the people who are supporting this Pyramid question [do it], I think, largely on an emotional basis. Well, I don't believe that they'll carry it over into a campaign. In fact, the real, basic problem of Pyramid is people.

If you were interested only in restoring the fisheries at Pyramid for the Indians, the way to do it, that would be to build a chain link fence around the entire reservation and permit free egress and ingress to the Indians and not permit the pressure of the white fishermen—I'm sure that some descendant of Mr. Skimmerhorn could go out and catch another world-breaking trout. Pyramid, like many other fishing areas, is subject to just terrific pressure. And I do believe—and I have urged strongly that what is known as the Marble Bluffs dam be constructed. I believe I referred to this before, but I want to repeat this. If the Marble Bluffs dam, with the proper controls and diversion were built, the fish could get upstream to spawn. This, for what's involved, I believe can be justified on an economic basis. It would cost a great deal of money. The lake might still fall in any dry cycle, which I—well, I'm sure it will. But, depending on the precipitation that occurs, it will move within the range of between eight feet up or eight feet down. But the fish get upstream, there would be some natural spawning, and the fishery would be enhanced. But if the fishing pressure increases, why, it's very questionable whether you can make this one of the most wonderful fishing places

in the world. Whoever insists on having the greatest fishing in the world must go in the area of the Arctic Circle, certainly into the very isolated areas of Canada and Alaska.

[What's the answer, then, for the Indians who have to maintain themselves out there? Do I think the reservation ultimately will be abandoned?] Well, no, I don't think so. I think they will continue to live there. As they begin to become educated, they will find work and good-paying jobs (and some of them have done just this), if, as I said before, you prevented the white people from coming there. There was a natural barrier to relieve the pressure prior to the time of Frémont. It was isolated then from all fishing pressures. Prior to that time, it had been that way for we don't know how many hundreds of years. If the same thing [occurred] and the Indians desired to live off the land as they did then with hunting and fishing, they could dry their fish and dry their rabbits and gather pine nuts just as they've always done.

I'm not one of those who feel that the Indians have been so wronged, that opportunity was taken away from them. And if the desire of the majority of the people in the United States who want to have them have their natural condition, why, this is the way to do it, is to keep the other people out, completely. And if they enjoy living that way, why, this is the way to do it.

I don't think you can put enough fish in there and get enough fishing people and put enough boats on that lake to really provide \$40,- and \$50,000 homes for the Indians and to maintain the kind of life that this would seem to be in keeping [with] off of the fisheries.

[Do I really consider this a major or ideal recreational resource?] I do not, for the simple reason trees do not grow there. There's something in the soil, so there's no

sign of any deciduous growth around the lake. I just don't believe that there's any way. You could just blow the dam, Derby Dam, out of the Truckee River, and you could not create an area like Lake Tahoe. Natural conditions do not permit that—soil, dry atmospheric conditions—whatever it is that's necessary. Of course, you can go back into some of the canyons where those little ranches are, which is private ground and apparently must predate the Indian reservation, which is 1859, or those private properties would not exist. Now, there are, on those creeks away from the lake, away from the natural lake bed, or the old lake bed, [places which] apparently support tree life. There's fruit trees; there's apple trees. I've never checked, but I believe those places just—that wherever you go in Nevada, wherever there was a small stream of running water, someone decided they'd like to live there, So that must be the only reason for those private developments, or ranches. They were a basis for a sheep or a cattle operation, and they used that where they lived for their operating quarters, and then moved on to open range.

In all of these discussions, of course, we hear what is often referred to as "expert testimony" by noted and sometimes, I think, would-be noted hydrologists who have the answer as to just how much water ranch operators and irrigators need to raise their crop. I can't help but observe that, to my knowledge, I know of no hydrologist who is operating a ranch property on a fluctuating stream. I believe you can forecast somewhat more accurately where you use water out of a completely controlled lake, where the flow can be released as desired, or as necessary. But in addition to that, I'd like to make the further observation that the need for water is, I would say, never exactly the same in one year that it is in the other.

I remember well, many years, if you had a late spring, or had late spring storms, you did not need to irrigate as early. Your weather might be cooler, and you would not desire to irrigate—well, when it was still freezing. It would serve no purpose. So I firmly believe that to arbitrarily set a figure is beyond the competence of any human being. I've known people to irrigate in March; I have, on certain areas, if you'd have an exceedingly dry winter. And I have known at times when that same land would not be irrigated until the first of May if you'd had a wet spring. So to set a firm figure, to me, is impossible.

Of course, during the years we have heard a great deal of discussion of the Newlands Project. Just as in almost all irrigation projects that I am familiar with, they planned a development far in excess of the water available. People just never seem to understand this; certainly, this is true of the past.

When the Newlands Project was organized, [the] Department of Interior withdrew—give or take a few thousand acres—for the Truckee-Carson irrigation project some 230,000 acres. It certainly was overextended. It has now dropped—I think their estimate of cultivated land is—they are still talking of something [around] 74,500 acres, and it is seldom that there's this amount of land under cultivation. This is for several reasons. Of course, people must, in irrigated farming, occasionally, for one reason or another, such as an infestation of grasses [for] which they have to leave land lay idle, keep working it. So as a practical standpoint, although they have water rights for some seventy-odd thousand acres (and which I am in agreement with, they should have), they seldom are raising crops on that many acres. And only the test of time really proves how much land you may bring into cultivation.

Exactly the same thing happened on the Walker River. They sold water rights to a much larger area than they had water for, and there were just a substantial number of people lost their life's savings in trying to bring land in cultivation, which was not possible. And, of course, the same thing happened in the Fallon area. You can find numbers of abandoned places which are gradually acquired by others in enlarging their development. The units were not self-sufficient. And in many cases, I understand that the district has repurchased those lands and then resold them to provide more water for other areas. So these projects are all over ambitious. I think it's a great unkindness, and—well, more than that. It's an injustice to move people on an area that—if they were experienced, they would know that they couldn't hope to pay out. So I feel that the project left something to be desired in its original planning. It is today an established community, and I believe it must be given consideration as such by everyone, rather than to just simply say that there's water being wasted and it should be diverted to Pyramid.

And I'd like to ask that some of the critics of the system go into an area, [In] fact, if I could afford it, I would like to give some of the critics or experts a piece of ground with the understanding that they pay the taxes and stay on it for twenty years to see whether or not they made it. I question that they would make it.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE WASHOE PROJECT

I believe that we were hopeful that we could overcome the 160-acre limitation. And I believe it was about 1914—of course, I wasn't living quite as seriously then as [laughing] I ultimately did, but there was quite a movement on. And they formed what was known as the Carson Valley Irrigation

District, Unit No. 1, and I remember that H. F. Dangberg, Jr. and C. M. Henningsen and William Dressier made a trip to Washington for the purpose of trying to interest the then Secretary of the Interior, and I'm sure the Bureau of Reclamation, in construction of a project on the upper Carson. But again, they were faced with a 160-acre limitation, and, of course, you could not get public support for any project in this valley that included the 160-acre limitation. It, of course, was just dropped. And there was some opposition, of course, by Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, but whenever they ran against that wall, that 160-acre limitation, why, people in this area backed away. There's some testimony of record showing the number of farms that were over that size, and we tried to include it in the testimony before a congressional committee.

Of course, the Washoe Project was passed, which included what was known as the Engle formula. Congressman Clair Engle of California realized no 160-acre farm was an economic unit. In some areas, they resorted to subterfuge and just went ahead and sold to each other and nothing happened. And others, why, of course, if you had a large family, why, I think the people deeded; if they had five children, they'd deed 160 acres to each child and to each mother and to each husband. And, of course, in my opinion, that is still subterfuge. And people in this area felt it would be a cloud on the title if they ever attempted to sell. And they just refused to go for it.

But the Clair Engle formula on the Washoe Project included the provision that you could furnish water to land in excess of 160 acres provided that the interest was paid on the construction costs for that particular property which was in excess. But this more than doubled the cost of the water; they felt the ability to pay was something like \$1.75

an acre-foot, and again, this recollection, but it's reasonably close. And, of course (I think we had a 160-acre limit), the excess payments above 160 would come to about \$3.50. Well, I suppose at present prices, this might have been acceptable. It was not at the time that the Washoe Project was initiated.

And the other difficulty, certainly on our ranch property, when they attempted to have contracts signed for the Washoe Project—we were off of the ranch. But the people that had purchased it came in with their contract that had been offered to them, and the Bureau of Reclamation figured that that particular property, the purchase, 720-odd acre feet of water, said they would have a full water right. And he asked me what my opinion was, and I said, "The only answer I could give is to—I'm not going to tell you what to do, but I can only tell you what I would do if I were still on the property. And that is I would purchase and obligate the ranch to purchase 250 acre feet." But with the amount of water that we had and storage that we had already paid for, why, the ranch couldn't possibly use an additional 700 acre feet unless we were deprived of much of the water that we had historically used. In other words, the water that had been used for a period of fifty or sixty years, which we certainly felt was ours as it came down the stream, would be stored and then sold to us. And I said, "I'm just telling you that I would not sign the contract. Now if your opinion is different and you're more anxious for water why, you must know."

And to one man, one of the owners who could very well afford to make the investment, could have paid for this water, I said, "Well, I don't think that you can sell it. I would contract for some of that water myself at \$1.75 if I could gain a property right." But you could not gain a property right. And, of course, the result was those people did not sign the

contract. So one of the reasons—and the Bureau of Reclamation knows the reason—that I opposed the way that they were trying to sell the project was the fact that we didn't know how much of the river would belong to us after the dam was built, whether water that we stored, historically *had used*, and everyone in the valley had used, was going to be stored and then sold to us. Why, of course, it made a great difference, and the area never found out. Of course, I understand that some figures that were suggested that what portion of the stream flow should be available for people in the valley, which were developed in compact negotiations, was acceptable to the local Bureau of Reclamation representatives. But they were not acceptable to agencies in Washington. And we found out, in the several trips that we made to Washington, that there was more conflict between the agencies *there* than there was between the local people, by far. You'd run into this every once in a while: "Well, if it wasn't for so and so, we could do this, but don't say I said so" [laughing]. So your hands are tied too often.

COMMENT ON THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

They have been of real assistance in furnishing technical assistance in leveling land and in getting community effort in diversion dams. Certainly, they have done their part in being interested in reservoir construction and in technical help. And, of course, I think they almost have the same telephone number; there are times when it's just hard for me to know where the Soil Conservation's authority ends and the agricultural stabilization committee begins, or vice versa. But they work closely together, and there are times when I think that they furnish more assistance than perhaps the cooperator

should pay for himself. But that, of course, is a matter of opinion, whether this is the way it should be. The people [who] have really used them, of course, would disagree with me on that, and I have no objection to that. It's an established agency. You might question whether the government or the people needed them all, but once there, when the Congress sets this up and it's available, I suppose we should use it.

SUMMARY ON POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

We perhaps should discuss the general political philosophy of Douglas County. Of course, over the years, Douglas County has been noted for being the banner Republican county of the state of Nevada. However, I must also say, on the local level, they were never—well, never afraid of crossing party lines. am sure that many of the candidates of the Democratic party that were serving in the courthouse and doing a job had Republican support. If the community felt they were doing a job, they disregarded political affiliation completely. In [the] case of the recorder's office, I'm certain that every recorder for more than fifty years has been a member of the Democratic party. We have elected Democratic sheriffs.

People certainly took their party organization seriously, but they took their obligations of citizenship even more seriously. I believe it's just the tradition of Douglas County, or *has* been that way for many, many years. I might add we are not sure that we can always keep it that way.

[How about my own political philosophies?]
[Consulting papers] Well, I could read you one

paragraph, and I believe that would cover it all. I had occasion to put together a few remarks at one time. I was in the middle of, or you might say in the front line of state finances. I probably wouldn't think of writing it today, but I still believe what I said then:

It is painfully written in the pages of history, and it is obvious to all who will read, that long before any government can give its people all that they want, it will have taken from them all that they have, that a people which characteristically seeks freedom from responsibility eventually ends up without freedom.

I have nothing to add to that.

ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

A

Adams, Jewett W., 1
Agriculture, Nevada department, 33
Air Force, U. S., 33-34
Alpine County, California, 99
Alpine Land and Reservoir Company, 18-19, 99-101
 See also: U. S. vs. Alpine
Anderson, John vs. Henry Bassman, et al, 109-110
Arizona vs. California, 46
Armstrong, Charles J., 45

B

Baker, C. D., 30, 31, 32
Bank of America, 39
Basic Magnesium Industries (BMI), 37-39
Basques, 10, 11, 15
Bell, Rex, 89
Biltz, Norman H., 38
Black, Richard M., 53
Boak, C. C., 85
Boardman, Horace P., 114
Boyle, Emmet Derby, 24
Bray, Mildred N., 27
Budelman, Herman, 28, 30, 31-32, 50, 85

C

Cahill, Robbins E., 31-32
California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission, 102-112, 113, 120
Carson City, Nevada, 2, 5

Carson River (Nevada-California), 18, 21, 90-97, 98, 100, 103-104, 109-111, 112, 113-114, 117-119, 127
Carson Valley (Nevada), 1-9, 10-13, 16-22, 98-102
Carson Valley Hay and Produce Company, 8
Cashill, William J., 95
Central Nevada Resource Agency, 81-82
Church, James Edward, 114
Clark County, Nevada, 52
Commissioners, Douglas County, Nevada, 4
Conservation and Natural Resources, Nevada department, 44, 46-47, 49
Coughlan, Barbara, 47-48, 49
Cox, Walter, 30, 35
Crater Lake (California), 100
Crumley, Newton H., 66

D

Dangberg, Henry Fred, Jr., 100, 127
Dangberg Land and Livestock Company (Carson Valley), 2
Democrats, 26, 30-31, 37, 69, 73, 75, 131
De Ricco, Elmo, 46-47
DeVore, George, 94-95
Douglas County High School (Carson Valley), 4, 7
Douglas County School Board, 12

Dressler, Fred, 18-19, 23,
34
Dressler, William F., 18-
19, 23, 26, 27, 127
Duffin, Press W., 29

E

Engle, Clair, 127, 128
Englestead, Van, 84

F

Fairview district school
(Carson Valley), 6, 8
Fish and Game Commission,
California, 107
Fish and Game Commission,
Nevada, 107
Foley, Roger, 96
Fort Wayne, Indiana, 9
Frank, William J., 53
Frantzen, John, 100
Frazier, Maude, 52

G

Gallagher, Charles D., 53
Gambling Control Board
See: Gaming Commission
Gaming Commission, Nevada
state, 73-75
General Foods Corporation,
6
General Services Administra-
tion, U. S., 38
Germans, 1-2, 11
Germany, 1
Gettysburg College (Pennsyl-
vania), 8-10
Goldfield, Nevada, 8
Gorvine, Albert, 41

H

Hawley, Thomas P., 90
Heise, Fritz, 100
Henningesen, Carsten M.,
100, 127

Hermit Valley (California),
19
Hershiser, Beulah, 12
Hesson, A. W., 9
Hickel, Walter, 112, 117
Hicks, Marion, 65
Horlacher, Fred C., 32
Humphrey, Marvin, 77

I

Indian Affairs, U. S.
Bureau, 62, 112
Indians, 10-11, 19-20, 61-
62, 96-97
Indian Service, U. S., 107
Interior, U. S. Department,
96, 97, 106, 112, 119,
127
Isbell, C. V., 71
Italians, 10

J

Johnson, Kenneth F., 28,
30, 35, 85
Jones, Clifford, 65
Jones, Elizabeth E. Wey-
burn, 99
Justice, U. S. Department,
94, 96

K

Keith, George W., 99
Knisley, Raymond L., 44,
70-72, 77, 81, 82

L

Lamy, George I., 99
Las Vegas, Nevada, 36
Lattin, Ralph, 31, 32, 35,
50, 65
Laxalt, Paul A., 112, 121
Legislative Commission,
Nevada state, 61
Legislature, Nevada state,
23-89, 102
Leland, Robert, 96, 113

Lemaire, Rene W., 30, 31,
32, 35
Livingston, Adolph, 99
Lobbyists, 36, 37, 81-86
Loomis, E. Frandsen, 29
Love, Malcolm, 42, 45
Lovelock, Forest, 35
Luning, Nevada, 8

Mc

McDonald, Russell, 66
McGuirk, Don, 29
McHenry [university]
report, 66

M

Marble Bluffs dam (Nevada),
121-122
Mason Valley (Nevada), 13-
14
Mills College, 6
Mina, Nevada, 8
Mono County, California, 10
Mormons, 2
Mueller, John V., 38, 39,
104n.
Munk, Harry A., 32
Musser, H. F., 99
Muth, Edmund, 111

N

Neddenriep, Fritz, 18-19
Neddenriep, William, 19
Nevada Cattle Association,
14, 81-82
Nevada Industrial Commission
(NIC), 76
Nevada Livestock Associa-
tion, 14
Newlands, Francis Griffith,
3, 101
Newlands Reclamation
Project, 101-102, 125-126
See also: Truckee-
Carson Irrigation
District
Nores, Edgar L., 32

O

Occidental Land and Improve-
ment Company, 3, 101
Oil and Gas Conservation
Commission, Nevada state,
53
Orr, R. R., 53

P

Pacific Valley (California),
19
Paley, Louis, 83
Peabody [school] survey,
50, 55
Personnel department,
Nevada state, 59-60
Pittman, Vail, 30, 33, 34,
37
Powers, Harold "Butch," 52
Price, L. T., 39-40
Prohibition, U. S., 12,
13-14
Purchasing department,
Nevada state, 60-61
Pyramid Lake (Nevada), 96,
97, 104, 113, 114-116,
117, 118, 119, 121-122,
123, 126
See also: Pyramid Lake
Task Force
Pyramid Lake Indian Reser-
vation, 96, 97, 104, 107,
112, 113, 121, 122-123
Pyramid Lake Task Force,
112-126

R

Reagan, Ronald, 112
Reclamation, U. S. Bureau,
95, 98, 112, 117, 118,
127, 128, 129
Red Lake (California), 100
Renda, Charles, 118
Reno, Nevada, 6, 7, 40
Republicans, 23, 26, 27,
28, 29, 30-31, 37, 54,
73, 131

Retirement Board, Nevada
state, 76-78
"Right to Work" law,
Nevada, 40-41
Robbins, John E., 26-28,
30, 51-52
Russell, Charles H., 49,
50, 51, 54-55, 64-65
Ryan, James G. "Sailor,"
84, 86

S

Sadler, Reinhold, 99
Sanders, C. F., 9
Sawyer, Grant, 68, 69, 72,
73, 74, 75, 81
Scott Lake (California),
100
Securities and Exchange
Commission (SEC), 37
Seevers, Farrell L., 53
Senate Bill 92, Nevada,
1957, 64-66
Settelmeyer, Edward, 6
Settelmeyer, George, 6, 8,
10
Settelmeyer, H. William,
1-2, 3-4, 5, 8-9, 10-11,
17, 92
Settelmeyer, Irma, 5, 6
Settelmeyer, James Theodore,
6
Settelmeyer, Maria Worth-
mann, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8-9,
17-18
Settelmeyer, William H., 5
Shamberger, Hugh A., 46-47
Sierra Pacific Power Com-
pany, 105
Sierra Valley (California),
108
Soil Conservation Service,
U. S., 130
Sommer, Clarence E., 30
Springmeyer, H. H., 2, 100
Springmeyer, Jeff, 41
Stillwater Wildlife Refuge
(Nevada), 116

Strosnider, Fred, 32
Surveyor-General, Nevada
state, 49
Swackhamer, William, 72

T

Tahoe, Lake, 32-33, 104,
106, 107
Tahoe Regional Agency, 33
Tallman, A. V., 35
Tax Commission, Nevada
state, 6, 31-32, 73
Taylor Grazing Act (1934),
15
Thornburg, William, 99
Tonopah, Nevada, 8
Truckee-Carson Irrigation
District, 105, 112, 113,
116, 117, 127
See also: Newlands
Reclamation Project
Truckee River (Nevada-
California), 94, 97,
103, 105, 108, 113, 115,
117

U

Udall, Stewart, 117
Union Mill and Mining Com-
pany, 90-91
*United States vs. Alpine
Land and Reservoir
Company*, 94-97, 100,
104, 110
See also: Carson River
*United States vs. Orr Ditch
Company*, 103, 104, 106
See also: Truckee
River
University of Nevada, 42-43,
44, 45, 67, 68, 69-70,
71-72, 87

V

Van Duzer, Clarence D., 4
Vaughn, E. Otis, 7
Virginia City, Nevada, 8

W

Walker River (Nevada-
California), 103, 107,
112, 125-126
Washoe Project (Nevada-
California), 95, 126-130
Welfare Department, Nevada
state, 47-49
Westergard, Roland, 47
Whitacre, Walter, 53
Wilson, Loyd, 32
World War I, 11-12
World War II, 12-13, 25

XYZ

Young, Clifton "Cliff,"
61-62

FOR REFERENCE ONLY

